

APPENDIX C: VERBATIM PUBLIC AND AGENCY COMMENTS

Comment (received 4/17/2006 via e-mail)

Yes you did send me the info and after review I thought that maybe I'm not as qualified, or have as vested an interest as the type of person that WSDOT may hope to have on the advisory group. I do have a bit of an agenda that I thought might interfere in making unbiased decisions, so as an unaffiliated community activist, I thought it may be better to stand down here. Let me briefly explain where I'm coming from, and please advise me if you think that it would be a good idea for me to make the application. Besides being a life-long Washington resident with strong political views on transportation issues: I'm for it! (...I think that was a joke...) I do have one issue in particular that is of great interest and is the primary reason that I made the inquiry. Councilman Steinbrueck had indicated that WSDOT may be contemplating some sort of arts or concert venue as part of the Colman redesign and I take great interest in this issue. As a long-time member of the music community, I am very pro arts. I was also recently involved in the Summer Nights at Gas Works Park issue which I helped to shut down because it was a horrible (and dangerous) placement, but particularly because the city utterly failed to perform any SEPA work whatsoever. Since I am a very pro-music type of guy, my investigation into the issue led me to look at ways to give One Reel and Summer Nights a permanent home where they will not have to worry about being jacked around as they were this year by Mayor Nickels (who, btw, was the person that actually placed Summer Nights at Gas Works Park over One Reel's objections...) This led to the big question of "what to do about Piers 62/63?" I advocated to Councilman Steinbrueck that I was in support of an immediate investment in repairs so that Summer Nights could return home as well as hopefully utilize the piers for plays and other arts events that could, through a small per ticket use tax, pay for the improvements. Councilman Steinbrueck indicated that any Pier rebuilding would probably be part of the waterfront plan that is tied into the whole viaduct replacement issue which as we all know is far from settled. Councilman Steinbrueck also indicated that he personally was in support of a plan to turn the Pier 62/63 area into a beach, and then indicated that WSDOT's plans may in fact contain in part a venue for music etc. I whole-heartedly support this concept, and would like to support this idea through involvement on the advisory group. I do have the time to take part in such activity. Do you think that I should submit an application to you? I look forward to your response!

Comment (received 4/21/2006 via mail):

I have no problem with a proposed expansion of Colman Dock. However, I have seen the obliteration of our waterfront by allowing high rise construction. I would urge you not to allow any increase in the existing 45 ft. height restriction.

Comment (received 4/24/2006 via mail):

As a resident of West Seattle in the area of the Fauntleroy/Vashon/Southworth ferry landing I strongly suggest your remake of Colman Dock include elimination of the Fauntleroy Dock and rerouting those ferries to Colman. The Fauntleroy Dock was built when the area was nearly undeveloped forest. This is no longer the case, and the increased traffic load is not acceptable. Only one street serves the area and all traffic must arrive and depart in one of two directions. The street traffic and waiting lines are a danger and a nuisance to residents. Overnight parking of ferry users' second cars on this side to avoid auto fares has led to wall to wall cars along the

streets, or to Zone 3 parking restrictions which require residents to litter their streets with signs and pay Seattle a yearly fee to park in front of their own overtaxed homes. late night. With Colman rework 10 years away from completion at best, we will not live to see any help from this project. We are left with the choice of living with the noise and danger of the ever increasing traffic, selling our home and leaving Seattle, or getting together with other West Seattle residents to see about getting Fauntleroy Dock declared a public nuisance and shut down, Colman or no. Perhaps a mass protest to the property tax assessment people will get some attention. The present situation is unconscionable.

Comment (received 4/25/2006 via telephone):

- WSF does not run a good business and is not clear about revenue projections expected from the Colman Dock redevelopment.
- How much revenue does WSF really expect to get?
- WSF should sell the rights to the Colman Dock property outright and not try to play developer.
- Riding the ferries is often a waste of time because of all the time spent waiting in line.
- There is no money in the system and in taxpayers' pockets to pay for all these extras (development). Concentrate on upgrading the vessels and replacing old vessels such as the Steel Electrics.
- Put additional money towards beefing up security at the ferry terminals and lifesaving equipment on the vessels.

Comment (received 4/21/2006 via e-mail):

This inquiry is in regards to the article in the Seattle Times this morning regarding the state teaming-up with a private developer for additional projects on the Coleman Dock. Trammell Crow Residential (TCR) is the nation's leading multifamily and mixed-use developer with more than 200,000 units developed to date. For more information please visit www.tcredidential.com. I was wondering when the state will be issuing a RFQ for the additional developments centered around the dock, and if there have been any studies conducted to assess the benefits of a residential component included in the future plans of the dock?

Comment (received 4/26/2006 via e-mail):

2011 is too long to wait for this. Are you kidding me?? I have been personally waiting for this since 1998 when I first moved there. Tim Eyman took care of that. If you guys can't do it let someone else step in that can. And sooner.

Comment (received 4/26/2006 via e-mail):

I strongly agree with Mr. Ottenback who was quoted in today's (4/26/06) Kitsap Sun concerning the rerouting of the Southworth ferry from Fauntleroy to downtown Seattle. There is nothing in West Seattle for commuters to do and public transportation there is horrible. You are forced to take a car across the ferry to get to where you want to go, which for me is almost always downtown. Meanwhile, downtown Seattle has jobs, nightlife, restaurants, the Seattle Center, sporting events and better mass transit (although it could and should be much better). I believe your current projection estimates are all incorrect. If there was fast (ie. Not having to stop at Vashon), reliable service from Southworth to downtown, the ridership would explode.

It seems to me that this process could and should be greatly accelerated. 2014 is a long, long time to wait!

Comment (received 4/20/2006 via public meeting):

While your list of environmental issues cover the gamut...Consider that decisions made will impact Design Concepts transportation policy and the environment. In a future with limited (or costly) energy, look to making planning decisions that support and encourage non-motorized and alternative forms of transportation (pedestrians, bikes, car pools, van pools, transit); look to discourage single occupancy vehicles.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

- Pedestrian circulation, bicycle access/egress/holding, transit access – get Metro to schedule 5-6 buses based on ferry schedule.
- Easier access from north, particularly on Mariner game days when traffic during commute times is forced to come from south (have to go to Jackson or King to u-turn!). This may be more of a circulation issue – city.

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Focus on transportation – don't gum up the works with a hotel or other "leisure" amenities. Make sure you keep the ferry passengers first and foremost in your planning.

Additional comments:

-Hold meetings such as this on west side of Sound (Bremerton and Bainbridge) as most users of Colman Dock probably live or work there and could provide input on how Colman Dock works (or doesn't).

-Consider putting the auto ferry terminal on Port of Seattle (publicly-owned) land opposite Royal Brougham/Atlantic. Convert Colman to a passenger-only terminal. The advantages include:

- Removing congestion from downtown grid
- Greater holding capacity
- Easier access to I-5/I-90
- Space for a true multi-modal transit center keyed to the ferry schedule (not the whims of Metro)
- Re-creation of the Mosquito Fleet passenger only ferries serving numerous ports on the sound.

Pier 48 – noticed is included in site area – could it be used as the Bremerton and/or Southworth (future) terminal? Also could be used for staging as construction occurs at Colman Dock.

Comment (received 4/20/2006 via public meeting):

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Roof garden/park open to the public for viewing and events.

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

The most beautiful spot at Colman Dock is the employee area at the stair landing at the south slip. It has planters. More planters with "growing things" would make the dock more pleasant.

Pier 48 is historical and should not be removed, and that a historical marine and ship museum should be an option. It should be used for the Pioneer and International District area residents to gather and experience the waterfront.

Additional comments:

Historical Pier 48 should not be removed. A historical marine and ship museum is one option. It should also be used for the Pioneer and International District area residents to gather and experience the waterfront.

Comment (received 4/20/2006 via public meeting):

I don't like the turnstiles at the terminal, or the restrictions on using fare coupons.

Comment (received 4/25/2006 via public meeting):

WSF will study a number of factors during the environmental impact statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Fish habitats, People habitat – creating great places for people on the waterfront – also Colman Dock can play a big role in connecting downtown neighborhoods.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

A reservation system to minimize the number of cars stored on the dock.

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

A reservation system could automate the whole loading process. Also, park space, restaurants, etc., are a great way to create people places.

Comment (received 4/25/2006 via public meeting):

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Look into future and consider potential security requirements on ferry system. When the Maritime Transportation Safety Act passed several years ago, WSF and other water-borne mass transit systems had to scramble to comply. Do not make mistake of assuming security needs will ease in future – leave room or ability to modify to allow for enhance vehicle and passenger search during periods of Marsec 2+3. Ferries still need to run when terrorists threats are more pronounced.

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

1. I love the wireless – keep it and increase the bandwidth. 2. Do not put the card readers in waiting area right next to choke point (doors to ferry ramp). Put them outside waiting area so that once customers re in the waiting area, they can proceed directly onto vessel.

Comment (received 4/25/2006 via public meeting):

WSF will study a number of factors during the environmental impact statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Visual impact – aesthetics.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Oppose raising height limits to permit higher developments, which would negatively impact vistas into the Sound.

Comment (received 4/25/2006 via public meeting):

WSF will study a number of factors during the environmental impact statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Parking requirements for development over terminal. Shoreline impacts from any change which affects the current shoreline. Land use impacts in Kitsap County from increased vehicle capacity: Urban Design

What constraints on low density sprawl development and road capacity increases will result from more vehicle capacity?

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Street car station. Street car extension south on Alaska Way: Stadiums and West Seattle. Widen sidewalks leading to terminal. Fish passage along the shoreline. Pedestrian scale lighting on routes from 1st to terminal.

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Wider and covered walkway on Yessler (farmers market on weekends).

Comment (received 4/25/2006 via public meeting):

WSF will study a number of factors during the environmental impact statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Historic structures and access to the Pioneer Square business area. The cumulative impacts from transportation and infrastructure replacement, Viaduct, seawall, etc.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

The project should focus on creating the most efficient transportation system, sustainable through fares and passenger uses. The product should instill a deterrent to automobile use.

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Charge passenger fare in and out of Seattle. Focus on the core mission of this mode of transportation moving people across water.

Additional comments:

I am concerned that the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project is not developing a secure effective system. Incorporating non-water dependent uses compromises the key purpose of the system, secure reliable mass transit over water.

Comment (received 4/25/2006 via public meeting):

WSF will study a number of factors during the environmental impact statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues

should WSF consider?

Alternative energy sources for ferries, terminals, and vehicles.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Data communications for traffic monitoring and scheduling. Security for riders and community.

License plate logging/analysis of vehicles to compare against Amber Alerts, stolen vehicles, parking violators...

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Wireless communications for commuters. Either WiFi enabled ferries or public access terminals for information regarding weather, traffic, news, transit, tourist interest, etc.

Comment (received 4/20/2006 via public meeting, comment give to Court Reporter):

I've already filled out one of the comments - oh, you're doing it down there - I've already filled out one of the comments, and that was the fact that I - and I came into the - I come into Colman Dock quite a few times. The one spot that really catches my eye is the - is the landing on the stairs at the south slip where the employees have some planters and greenery. And it's the only greenery on Colman Dock, and it's really quite beautiful to see the water and the greenery together.

And so any future plans, like if the future plans include a flat roof, perhaps there should be a landscaped garden roof and park on top of the building so that it becomes a very popular and en vogue thing, which is a green garden roof right now.

The other thing, too - the other point that I was just going to make on the comments is that any development which reduces the exposure of the water on the Alaskan Way I think is a negative impact on Alaskan Way. And that includes the development of residential areas south of Colman Dock that I've seen on one drawing. And also the removal of Pier 48. I understand Pier 48 has some piling problems and some deck problems, but perhaps with new technology, that could be overcome.

But I think Bainbridge waterfront is in need - or excuse me, Seattle waterfront is in need of a historical ship museum and a nautical museum. There is nothing here at all like that. And if we're to compete with other - other cities for tourist dollars, we should compare our historic ship facilities to that of the San Francisco Bay Area which has the National Park Service Historical Ship Museum at Aquatic Cove, or Park, along the waterfront in San Francisco. And we have nothing at all that compares to that.

Again I just want to reiterate, that no development should impede the visual experience of the water from Alaskan Way.

Comment (received 4/20/2006 via public meeting, comment give to Court Reporter):

I represent American Train Destination Lines. And I'm making a proposal for the Washington State Ferries to go into partnership with the various departments of the Department of Transportation. And, particularly, my interest would be getting federal railway funding for

projects that would include bringing the rail lines into the downtown waterfront area to service the shipping industry or maritime industry. This includes the passenger ship terminals, as well as the Washington State Ferries.

I'm also proposing that the existing ferry dock not expand itself and not destroy Pier 48, but to condense its operations for multipurposes. In other words, having a parking lot here or a parking facility building, a structure, that would go down below into the seabed, below seabed, and then come up and also connecting with the viaduct tunnel so that automobiles coming off the ferry or coming onto the ferry would use the tunnel entrance to the ferries, as well as the surface.

In other words, there would be exits to the tunnel, as well as to the surface, because primarily most of the traffic that comes off the ferries are going to the freeways, and this would be the best way to get that traffic to the freeways. Not very many people are taking their cars into Seattle and going up two blocks and parking it in a garage and then walking a block. They generally walk to that spot by pedestrian passenger traffic.

The proposal that I'm making today is viable today and would be big business for the area to have the railroad tracks come along the waterfront so that the railroad industry would be able to use it. And I'm not saying freight; I'm saying passenger industry, which is a very large and lucrative business.

Having the American Oil Express come in, having the Centennial, the Challenger, these are all presidential-class trains that could be coming into Seattle. They would bring in 1,500 per passenger.

Right now the Centennial is in Denver. Why is it not in Seattle? The Oil Express comes in about once, twice a year to Seattle. Why isn't it coming here periodically, coming through Seattle?

The private car industry: There are no facilities here for private car industry. The Washington State Ferries don't have facilities. Why can't a rail car be parked here? It would be money for them. If you're parking cars, you park other vehicles here that are surface transportation.

In San Francisco, at any time down there, there are 10 to 15 private car trains ready to service the people at any moment. These cars are for charter; however, the demand for them is so great, that it's six months' reservations just to get a car because they are big business for Amtrak and also for the rail passenger industry and the railroads. The freight railroads make money off of this.

The proposal of having a structured building - and that's where we come into here - is that the existing planning department is looking at the, strictly, automobile industry and not the passenger industry.

I do not drive. I do not own an automobile; therefore, I am part of 14 percent of the population who utilize the transit industry, and this includes the maritime industry. If I need to go to

London, that's 10 days away for me, three days by train to New York and seven days by ship to London. And there are other people that, in the United States, that want to have this.

We are purporting - reporting to the - to society or the nation that we - Seattle has affluent people. What kind of affluent people drive in automobiles and go nowhere? The affluent people in San Francisco, Los Angeles, New York, Boston, Chicago, well, you find them on board a train and sitting down and having a nice dinner with them. Here you can't do that because we're destroying the track yards and - so that these trains can't come in.

If the train - if the American Oil Express is able to have a definite train yard here and access to the waterfront, then packages can be sold, tickets can be sold for the Washington State Ferries' tourist program they have.

The tourists that came to me off of the ships didn't know where to go, didn't have enough information on Seattle, were looking for trains because their community had trains that they left from. And when they got here, they couldn't find anything to go anywhere. They saw the waterfront streetcar and asked if that went to Ballard. And, of course, that did not go to Ballard.

Then they said, "Well, where does it go?" And I said, "Well, look over down the street two blocks. That's the end. And if you look down the street at that tall building down there, which is the Amtrak station, that's where it goes, and that's it. And they go, "Wow, where can I go for a sandwich?" The idea is that we're not looking at transportation. We're looking at continuing our consumption of benzene or gasoline, and we're not looking at improving the quality of our life and the quality of our city. To build a Washington State ferry terminal, and having that terminal as a major transportation facility, where buses can come in, and right now, there's only two buses that service this area. And it's very difficult to go anywhere.

It's very difficult to get information from the Washington State Ferries Information Terminal on train travel or connecting with other trains or other transportation systems because they don't know how to use it. These people could only give me directions to get there by car. Well, if you don't own a car, then you have a difficult time having to get the information you need to go to your destination.

I think the City - Washington State Ferries for this time to record my message. I hope that we can work on a partnership with the Department of Transportation that includes the Federal Railway Administration and the railroad, as well as the streetcars, to improve Seattle's transportation and for all citizens. Let's let people who want to come to Seattle by train also be allowed to take Washington State Ferries.

The experience of last year was when we had our family reunion here, we utilized the Washington State Ferries. These people had to park their car 20 blocks away from the Washington State Ferries and walk to the Washington State Ferries. This is why we need to look at the Washington State Ferries' properties as a multi-transportation facility that will allow parking, bus terminals, and the streetcar operations, as well as heavy rail operations to service the ships.

Comment (received 4/24/2006 via e-mail):

This is very interesting as it seems you just recently finished a complete remodel of the whole facility.

Comment (received 4/18/2006 via e-mail):

I am appalled with the prospects of ruining our lovely waterfront with a tall project. Only greed for revenues would blind the professional planners to put forward such a bad proposal. Shame! I prefer a gracious lower multiuse building that can add to the look and feel of our historic and loved waterfront and the city's skyline. I realize how powerless one citizen who works and lives in the ferry's neighborhood can be--nevertheless, I do want to tell you how sad I am about this dumb idea. Thanks for listening.

Comment (received 4/17/2006 via e-mail):

Couple of comments. The last time I went to a WSDOT open house, I came with little knowledge of the project and left the same way. Information board displays were too crowded to read and digest, and they were under-staffed. Staffers present were mostly community relations folks, and they carried on private conversations with people one at a time, not talking to the group assembled. So, I hope your events are more organized and thought-through than this one was.

Since I'm in the same line of business you are, I can't understand the reluctance to make a presentation and take some Q&A near the start of the event. We do it all the time where I work. I think we've found it's more helpful to answer some of the known questions once for everyone, rather than hope the issues get covered in the one-on-one at the display boards.

Comment (received 4/23/2006 via mail):

Planning for expansion of the downtown ferry terminal should not include items not directly related to ferry operations and service. The proposed incorporation of a hotel into the dock expansion would produce two major problems:

1. Traffic servicing the hotel would add to the already massive concentration of ferry user vehicles, thus exacerbating traffic jams.
2. Future modifications of the terminal would have to work around a hotel or other non-ferry related structure. Maximum flexibility for the dock's principal purpose of loading and unloading vehicles and passengers should be retained. Future planning should not be painted into a corner.

Comment (received 4/22/2006 via mail):

Once again, the taxpayer/citizen of Seattle is given less than a week for "community input," this time on the Colman Dock expansion, an issue that is no doubt already an "under the table done deal". If you were honestly concerned about community input, you would have announced the opportunity something larger than a 2" article buried inside the paper, and provided more than a week for community response. Political tactics as usual. Regardless, I am writing to speak out against the notion of increasing the building heights from 45' to 75' with your dock expansion. From the moment I heard of the proposal to replace the viaduct with a tunnel, I KNEW the land vacated by removing the viaduct would be immediately turned over

to the developers to continue their march of ugly high rise condos along the waterfront. I laughed when I read the politicians' claims of "green belt, open waterfront, open views from the city."

I don't care what you do with your dock area as long as it stays below the current 45' height. I'm cynical enough from past experience with city development however, to believe the heights will go to 75' or far more and will indeed seal off the miraculous view we currently enjoy. And the architecture will continue to be as ugly and insensitive to the terrain as what is down there already.

Please count this one letter as a strong vote against building height increases.

Comment (received 4/21/2006 via mail):

I think it is a stupid idea to build condos and hotel on water. What if we have a earthquake? They say we are due one. Where would the money come from? How about fixing I-5? It is so bumpy that my car shakes when I drive on I-5. I believe everyone feels the same way. Take care of what should come first.

Comment (received 4/28/2006 via e-mail):

Thanks for the invite and the presentation re the Colman dock project.

This project will be a key element to the long-term future of Seattle. As a cooperating agency with 'Authority Having Jurisdiction' status we will have specific comments relative to several components of the project.

Typically our responses are two-fold,

- 1) construction related impacts on emergency response and maintenance of required fire/life safety systems,
 - 2) project design and required systems, sprinklers, fire alarms, emergency access, etc.
- We are also open to discussions regarding 'co-use' of the Fire station 5 facility, but that use must not limit our emergency response capabilities or disrupt the fire station operations. These are essentially design issues that can be worked out later.

Do you know when you will be asking for first round inputs, or do you want comments on this first set of docs?

By the way, I am guessing that WSDot will need to resolve the 'holding area' problem before most other issues. If it is possible to 'second deck' the cars to resolve the holding area question, then you will likely receive a push to establish an intermodal hub on the second deck for buses and taxis as well. The statement re 'enough buses to handle 2500 passengers' is probably not accurate, due to local foot traffic demand. Until the analysis is done by Metro re: transportation destinations via bus from the waterfront, you won't be able to determine bus demand load.

Comment (received 5/1/2006 via mail):

I am writing on behalf of the board of the Association of King County Historical Organizations, a membership association with more than 140 museums, historical societies,

ethnic heritage groups, and individuals interested in heritage education and historic preservation. We are excited about the opportunity to comment during the early scoping period on the Washington State Ferries' plans to upgrade and redevelop Colman Dock/Pier 54 on Seattle's historic Central Waterfront.

Colman Dock has played an important role in the lives of Puget Sound residents for decades. It is not only a transportation hub, it is part of the sweep of Washington State history, a place where people have gathered to enjoy the beauty of our state and experience our economic vitality. It is our belief that a new Colman Dock should honor that history. WSF has an opportunity to create a destination for residents and visitors that raises the visibility of our maritime history and heritage. We would ask that WSF do more than put up a few interpretive signs and historic photographs. We believe Colman Dock should have significant public spaces and infrastructure that encourage residents and visitors to pause and reflect on the history of Washington State, the ferry system, and the communities the ferry system serves. These amenities would have several public benefits.

- Education - Role of WSF in transportation; History of Seattle, Vashon Island, Bremerton and other communities
- Create a more pleasant and interesting transportation experience
- Drive incremental revenue for WSF with venue rentals and commuter/tourism spending at vendors

We would be happy to discuss the potential for AKCHO and its membership to help WSF build memorable experiences at Colman Dock that would turn a functional component of a transportation system into a jewel in the crown of WSF, the communities it serves, and the state as a whole.

Comment (received 5/1/2006 via mail):

Quick note to say that having visited Cape Town, South Africa, and seen their Albert and Elizabeth waterfront I see and encourage expansion of the Colman Dock area. It has great potential.

Comment (received 5/5/2006 via public meeting):

He would like to see the terminal moved south of its current location (not just several feet south but further south towards the Duwamish). He feels that the terminal would be closer to several transportation connections that people use most and traffic problems would improve with the change in location.

-Playing devils advocate, he also thought if we keep the terminal in place, we would not be throwing out all the work (cleanup, capping, etc) that has been done at the terminal location. If the terminal was moved, how could we protect the past cleanup efforts? This issue should seriously be considered.

-Ferries create a tremendous amount of prop wash when they come in and out of the terminal and anywhere the terminal is, the prop wash will wash up sediments, whether contaminated or not.

-He also stated that there are too many agencies asking for public comment to the point he can't keep up with them. He owns his own business (Buds Jazz Records), he works with WRIA 9, DRCC and the Duwamish Tribe and claims there are too many meetings to attend.

Comment (received 5/4/2006 via mail):

Thank you for the opportunity for the City of Bainbridge Island to participate in the scoping process for the Seattle Ferry Terminal Improvement EIS. Because changes in ferry and terminal operations in Seattle will have immediate and significant impacts on traffic level of service and non-motorized travel and safety on Bainbridge Island, we are vitally interested in the EIS scoping process and the project itself. We request that the scope of the Seattle Ferry Terminal EIS include analysis of impacts to the Bainbridge transportation system for every alternative and/or operation plan that is proposed. This should specifically include analysis of vehicle queuing on the City's street system and on SR305, and impacts to the operation and safety of bicyclists and pedestrians at both ends of the route.

Comment (received 5/15/2006 via e-mail):

I am writing in response to the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project Comment Form distributed by WSF last week on the ferries. There isn't enough room on the form to respond well. I understand that WSF anticipates a need to accommodate a significant increase in passengers in the next few years. My concern is that it currently fails in so many regards to meet the needs of current customers that I'm at a loss to understand how it will manage a dramatic influx of riders successfully.

WSF Operations

Additionally, I believe that WSF needs to publicly address future security standards and how it will meet them. I take the Bainbridge/Seattle ferry each work day so my comments largely reflect this experience. The ferries currently have little apparent regard for schedule. It is more common for a ferry to fail to arrive or leave late than on schedule, barring emergencies or legitimate delays, yet the system sets the sailing times. This statement is true regardless of whether or not ferries are making continuous trips or have had in-port layovers. I can't count the number of times in which I've had to catch a late-night ferry that has been in dock on a layover, in which it left 5 -15 minutes late. This is not a car- or passenger-induced delay, merely discourtesy on behalf of the captain or whoever determines when loading and leaving will occur. This would have to change for the better to accommodate more passengers.

Long term commuters have pleaded for years for ventilation in the waiting room. It is stifling in the terminal when the weather is warm or there are a lot of bodies. A couple of years ago we got fans which sometimes run, or not, but which don't do anything to reduce the problem. We aren't allowed to have the seaward doors open anymore, although they alleviated the problem somewhat.

Changes historically have been and are currently made to the terminal with little apparent regard for customer service or user function. As two examples, the new turnstiles have been installed in a manner which makes it difficult for people with luggage, packages, bags, tow-behinds, carry-alls, or walking-age children to get through the gap. People in these groups compose the vast majority, not the exception, to the passenger makeup. The turnstiles are simply too close together. I will remind you that the ferry is our bus system. People go back and forth on the ferry carrying a significant amount of stuff, much of which includes large objects.

With the newest design of the temporary upgrades, more attention was paid to food court crud than passenger requirements. Once you've paid your fare, there are few seats, regardless of the fact that one's wait can be up to an hour and twenty minutes (on the late boats). Also, the seats which are there are grim. If one is elderly, disabled, carrying children, etc., this seat-less wait is grim.

New cabinets have been installed in this area which will one day apparently have ticket dispenser in them. Although they've been there for months and are inoperable, they're located in a place which makes seating near them or passage past them impossible due to their inconsiderate location.

Will these kinds of situations continue to occur while you continue to process greater numbers of riders?

"Last call" for boats is often incomprehensible, too hushed or simply not delivered to be useful. "Last call" is actually a useful tool for passengers hustling to make a ferry but is casually delivered or can't be heard through an anachronistic sound system. As the ferry doesn't depart on a reliable schedule, we need SOME indication of what the departing vessel's intentions are. When asked, two WSF terminal workers (one at Coleman, one on Bainbridge) have stated that "it's just customer service" so they don't have to do it. Well, it's not even customer service if it's not provided.

One thing grossly lacking at the terminal now is a representative at sailing times that can answer questions and get things done. Ticket takers are often uninformed about current ferry events, such as "what is the current anticipated delay right now?" or "Now that we've got people becoming faint in the waiting area, can we please get some fresh air in here?"

One can't buy monthly passes at the terminal!!! I can buy a monthly pass at the bus and train stations and, when I lived in an area where I took a commuter airline, at the airline counter, but I can't buy a monthly ferry pass at the ferry counter. I can buy singletons and books of tickets, but not passes. This is absurd and unhelpful.

The Madison St. pedestrian overpass is in poor condition with a very uneven walking surface, has no handrails on the inclines for the disabled, and is without regular maintenance. It's often dirty, flooded due to backed-up drains or subject to on-the-head downpours from the downspout of an adjoining building. The stairwell from the overpass to the corner of Western and Madison is filthy, slick underfoot and rests on a corner that floods consistently and badly in wet weather. It's poorly lit and often engenders a somewhat creepy-feeling in the dark with its poor sight-lines, detritus and broken beer bottles. I recognize that these aren't technically WSF problems per se, but WSF needs to work more in concert with the City of Seattle to ensure that pedestrian-ways are well built, kempt and maintained. The existing commuting population has issues here, what will more people experience?

Once one makes it onto the ferry, there are is an additional plethora of problems needing attention now. Ignoring these as WSF has done in the past will only make them worse in the future. The customer complaint/suggestion system is irretrievably broken. I have been

commuting for 9 years. In this time, I have filled out my share of complaints and suggestions and turned them into the 2nd Mate's office. Despite the fact that I'm assured each and every one is responded to within a week, with but one exception, I have NEVER HAD A RESPONSE. I guess I'm a sucker, because I'm still sending this missive in with the hopes that it will be heard and make a difference.

The floor is often cleaned, waxed or polished during commute runs. Often. Frequently. Toilet room halves are often closed off during commute runs for cleaning. Often. Frequently. When passengers complain, we get told that WSF has a standing policy that these actions never take place during commute runs so it's not happening. Period. If this answer is designed solely to enrage and disenfranchise your customers, it's working. What this type of bureaucratic baloney does is to convince your customer base and tax payers that WSF is not responsive.

In the women's rooms on the Bainbridge runs, there are rarely paper hand towels in the dispensers, clean/dry hand towels on the cloth rolls, the cloth roller towels don't dispense properly (the delay can be up to 35 seconds) and the heaters in the blower hand dryers don't provide heat. We are asked to keep our belongings with us at all times, yet there is no room in the toilet stalls to place a package or back pack. If you are with a friend, that friend can provide baggage oversight. If you are traveling alone or are foreign to the area and have no acquaintances, you must take your articles into the restrooms and toilet stalls. These are basics and need to work for the current capacity before the new capacity sets in.

There is not enough safety gear on board to satisfy the current boat loads of passengers. The assumption by WSF is, in a catastrophic event, that a proportion of the passengers will be able to get into the available life rafts. The rest will have to wait for a ferry coming back on its return route to pick up the remainder. This assumption reigns despite the low temperature of the water and the high likelihood that a pick-up boat is more than 20 minutes out. It is not uncommon that a ferry on its way to or from the island must wait for the other to clear the channel on its way in the other direction. The boats are often more than 20 minutes away from each other.

My understanding, fuzzy at best, of the planned security upgrades required as part of the new terminal will require individual passenger screening and screening of carry-ons. If this is the case, I request significant consideration be given to how and where the procedures will be accomplished. Given that the ferry system functions as the bus system for trans-Sound commuters, and that we normally carry a quantity and variety of legitimate articles not carried in the passenger cabin of an airplane, we'd like to understand how the screening will be carried out, by whom, with what level of timely efficiency, etc.

Finally, I'm hoping against hope that you will actually read and respond the comments you receive. I am not convinced, based upon all the above complaints, that this comment procedure is anything more than a bureaucratic course of action designed to satisfy the requirement that WSF have a public comment period. I sincerely hope that I'm wrong.

Please put me on the list to receive project mailings.

Comment (received 5/13/2006 via e-mail):

- Ensure that the walk on passengers with tickets/passes are not required to stand in a long line simply to show/drop off ticket.
- Eliminate the baseless and illegal (ie no statute/ordinance) proscribing right turns into vehicle areas from Alaskan Way except for van pools/motorcycles. There is no basis in the law - of which I am aware - for the SPD to prohibit right turns to some vehicles.
- Sue the subcontractor that installed the floor in the renovated terminal and fire the WSF employer who managed the project.
- Provide information to passengers re: cause of a delay. The fiasco last year when the student threw his backpack into a ferry terminal causing a long delay left me wondering why WSF personnel in the terminal were not given information to waiting passengers.
- Foot traffic is as important as vehicle traffic. Ensure that the Marion St. viaduct remains open during construction.
- Re operation of boats during commuter hours: Why is the men's head on the Bainbridge run cleaned during the time of heaviest use?

Comment (received 5/13/2006 via mail):

- As a Bainbridge Island commuter, one way to improve operations is to make sure departure times are not the same. Currently, Bremerton and Bainbridge runs leave to 5:30 p.m. (the highest commuter time) leaving the holding areas for passengers at the Seattle terminal crowded, stuffy and on warm days, unbearably hot. Have the restrooms monitored for cleanliness and tissue regularly. If you want tourists and commuter travelers to enjoy their time at the terminal, there's nothing like a clean restroom.
- Clean up the outside area by the terminal. Put hanging flower baskets by the entry on Alaskan Way. Make the entrance more inviting and clean. Compare Vancouver B.C.'s terminal with Seattle's, and Seattle's looks dumpy and grubby. Keep the sidewalks washed and clean by McDonald's. It wouldn't take much effort.
- You should consider how much waste comes from the ferry itself. Is there a way to reduce the diesel smoke from the stacks? Is the ferry system making sure human excrement and excess diesel fuel isn't being dumped into the Puget Sound? Is the ferry system making sure that trash (papers, coffee cups, etc.) isn't landing in the Puget Sound?
- Thanks for letting us commuters be a part of this transition. I've been riding the ferries for over 20 years now and have seen the huge growth. You mentioned that possibly Southworth passengers will dock in Seattle, but you should also consider having Kingston ridership coming into Seattle. The Kingston, Poulsbo, Silverdale areas have grown close to 20% and many work in the Seattle area, where most of the better jobs are located. You must consider allocating time and energy to expanding the Kingston run into Seattle too.

Comment (received 5/13/2006 via mail):

- Because of only adding chairs to the 2 Bainbridge/Seattle boats (not more boats, not more sailings) for the next 25 years the increased amount of passengers not able to get on a boat will be huge. SO they need places to sit - a lot larger holding area will be necessary for both cars and walk-ons.
- Move the inconvenient turnstiles back to the ticket booths.
- Widen "security doorway" to equal loading ramp width (to eliminate the horrible bottleneck that now exists).

- Put people who use the system, design the system - not the yahoos you have now designing this stuff.
- Traffic needs to be modified so that 1 boat load of cars can be continuously unloaded, if that means filling the dock before going on the street, then do it. Get rid of all employee parking to accomplish this.

Comment (received 5/13/2006 via mail):

- Bathrooms need improvement
 - Recycling of food waste
 - Better waterfront design (more naturalistic look)
 - Improve views of water and mountains
 - Hire some of those homeless guys
 - Keep (undecipherable) under control
 - Integrated transportation - better connection with public transit and limo services
 - Eco-friendly materials in all construction - do LEED standards
 - Quicker access for pre-paid autos/bikes
 - Laptop access
 - Look at People for Puget Sound's drawings of what the waterfront could look like then model some.
 - Salmon habitat should be considered in consultation with experts (marine riparian zone enhancements)
 - Green building techniques and materials (including pervious pavement, green roof, biosoils, etc) especially to mitigate all that runoff
 - Use of eco-friendly fuels that pollute less.
 - The turnstiles do not help - what purpose are they for? They make it hard to bring luggage through.
- We shake our heads...
- Who is paying for all of this? We're concerned about fares going up.

Comment (received 5/13/2006 via mail):

My understanding is the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project would include closing the Fauntleroy embarkation and disembarkation point. This may be fiscally efficient but exacerbates an already congested area - I then spend more time waiting in lines wasting more gas - it would be grossly inefficient from a passenger standpoint - all this will be 10x more problematic as the Alaskan Way Viaduct undergoes construction.

Comment (received 5/13/2006 via mail):

- Improve access to the services available in the terminal building to auto passengers, currently getting into the terminal building from the auto staging area is a very convoluted process.
- Encourage more bicycle and motorcycle commuting by providing a shelter from the elements, during staging times.
- Provide access to Alaskan Way in both directions for offloading ferries, instead of one way for Bremerton ferries when Bainbridge is also offloading.
- Commuter communications could be improved by utilizing a low frequency FM radio channel to update sailing times and possible problems.
- Faster ticket processing methods.

-The new Colman Dock should be aesthetic and be constructed with long-range vision

Comment (received 5/5/2006 via e-mail):

I wanted to let you know that I attended today's meeting of the Waterfront Partners Group, the citizens group advising the Seattle city planners about their concept plan for the waterfront. I have attended every meeting since last fall, and I've been pleased with the progress of the plan. Staff will be presenting their plan to the city council's committee of the whole on June 5 at around 2:30. I plan to be there, and I'm planning some remarks on behalf of AKCHO and our call for a wooden pier historic district. This is a critical moment for our work toward a city landmark and a National Historic District focused on piers 54-59. The city planning staff has been very receptive to Carol Tobin's comments about preservation and our own ideas. After consulting with the AKCHO board, I will likely press our case for a landmark district as an integral part of the concept plan and as a critical addition to the city's historic preservation program with incredible opportunities for public benefit beyond the viaduct issue itself. I will be coordinating with Carol and possibly John Chaney of Historic Seattle as well. You might also be interested to know that AKCHO is now taking an active role in the Washington State Ferries planned revamp of Colman Dock. We are anxious that the new facility integrate its vital place in the history of our region in a highly visible way with strong public benefit.

Comment (received 4/25/2006 via agency):

1. Are the AWW and Colman Dock projects coordinated, especially in regard to mitigation?
2. What about the off-shore island concept previously considered – it should continue to be considered. Spoils material from the AWW project could be used to create the island (or clean dredge spoils from elsewhere); the fill material with sloping shore edges might provide opportunities for increased marine habitat.
3. Please entertain the idea of the off shore island concept.

Comment (received 4/25/2006 via agency):

1. Is co-development part of the project – will it be analyzed in the EIS.
2. The fishing exclusion area should be examined (is it effective, correctly sized) and reflected in the project design—he suggested that the Tribe needs to participate early and often as the project designs progress. Since 9-11 areas of exclusion have been developed that limit fishing access. This should be addressed. Seems like there is always the need for more over water coverage.

Comment (received 4/25/2006 via agency):

1. How does SAFETEA-LU relate to co-development?

Comment (received 4/25/2006 via agency):

1. It would be helpful to know how the various groups (TAG, CAG, etc.) will interact/what their roles, responsibilities and authority will be. Because agencies have limited staff, we can't attend all group meetings—it will be important for agencies to know where to apply their attention and resources.
2. The EIS should consistently (across all technical disciplines) examine the effect of WSF growth on Bainbridge and Kitsap County, and how it will relate to growth management and the provision of transit services/facilities.

Comment (received 4/25/2006 via agency):

What is meant by “SAC-like” process for the TAG?

Comment (received 4/25/2006 via agency):

1. Is the role of the TAG going to be more conversational while plans are being developed or rather subsequent review and approval similar to the SAC process (Linda Gehrke/ FTA said she is looking for consistency between CRC and Colman Dock in terms of process/roles).
2. It is assumed that all design options will need to be kept on the table until a final decision is made on AWW.
3. Need to think about how the project will affect the rate of growth in communities served—it should be analyzed in the EIS (Steve Saxton/FHWA commented that the project needs to be consistent with local plans and policies).
4. What did the State legislature pass in regards to POF and what are the ramifications to the project (Linda Gehrke/FTA commented that POF needs to be addressed, as an alternative, in the EIS—it does not matter whether it is WSF or privately operated)?

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via e-mail):

The biggest issue for me is for you to re-design the terminal to allow for passengers to wait outdoors if that is more comfortable for them. During commuter runs, the waiting area becomes extremely toasty and gamey due to all those bodies packed into such a small area. Even in the winter, you can observe people stripping off coats and sweaters and mopping the perspiration from their foreheads.

I have complained about this in the past, pointing out that WSF has fans mounted, but I am assuming the fans are for decoration only since they are rarely run. Tonight, again, when I arrived, I saw people removing clothing and sweating profusely while waiting in that awful space. No fans. No open doors. Just a hot stuffy room.

When I first started commuting 6 years ago, we were allowed to wait on the terrace-like area between the terminal and the entrance to the slips. Those who were not hot-blooded could wait inside --- and inside was probably a lot more comfortable then than now as many bodies were located outside. Really! After you run to the terminal from Westlake or Safeco, you are a tad warm and don't need to be enclosed in a small space with a bunch of people.

I have tried waiting outside the pay area (outdoors near where the one bar has some seating), but the drawback is that boarding announcements are not made in that outside area and I was once so engrossed in my newspaper that I almost missed the ferry.

If the terminal cannot be re-designed to allow us to wait where we did in years past, would it at least be possible to arrange an outdoor area with maybe some benches where boarding announcements can be heard where one can wait prior to entering the paid area?

Please don't continue to make people wait in that stuffy horrible space you force us into now. And with summer coming, can we at least get some of those doors open for some fresh air? Put police tape across to keep people back, but something has got to be done.

If at least the ferries ran on time, then one could time his/her commute to arrive at the terminal with no waiting and walk right on. But that 6:20pm is rarely on time and wait we must. So please make the wait more tolerable.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via e-mail):

It seems that you are trying to streamline on/off loading and to improve traffic flow. I feel that if If you were to add a hotel, office spaces, and retail to the area it would be counter productive. Changing the retail would destroy the character and waterfront feel to the area. They are already planning to do this to downtown Winslow. Please do not turn our waterfront into Bellevue II.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via e-mail):

My comments are entirely from the standpoint of a commuter working pretty long days—6:20 from Bainbridge, 5:30 back. To meet my needs, the terminal must be functional. The businesses selling food and other items are irrelevant to me though I do not dispute that many commuters and tourists frequent and enjoy them.

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities? The critical points are ticket sales, which have to be efficient so passengers can get to their ferry, and ticket collection, so passengers can get to their ferry. I understand that soon ticket sales will soon be streamlined.

However, the only logical place for tickets to be collected is AT THE ENTRANCE to the waiting area, not causing a bottleneck at the exit. I hope the turnstiles are never activated in their present position. They should be at the east end of the waiting room. Security screening, if that is needed, can be carried out in a much more orderly and dignified manner.

What improvements should be considered? The management of traffic leaving the ferry and feeding onto and/or across Alaskan Way and onto Winslow Way and SR 305 needs to be looked at. Also, the SCHEDULE needs to be adjusted if the system cannot handle vehicular and walk-on passengers and still operate on time. The crews should be taught to appreciate the importance of efficiency in loading and unloading both vehicles and walk-on passengers. Many of your employees are very casual about this and actually seem to enjoy the power they have as hundreds of commuters watch them work slowly. Finally, it is obvious that the “hardware” used to board walk-on passengers at both terminals is hopelessly amateurish.

EIS issues? None for me except for traffic.

Comment (received 5/8/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?
Introduce more automation – in other words, for walk-ons there should be self serve ticketing and card reader turn-styles. I realize you’ll have to fight the unions to eliminate these jobs.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?
There is no need to replace the PO tent terminal – I ride the PO boat daily. I would rather see any funds go into more PO service versus a better PO terminal.

Additional comments:

Continue to try to get ferries to run on biodiesel.

Comment (received 5/8/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Walk on and drive on ferries between Southworth and Seattle. More walk-ons will decrease driver traffic. Increase holding areas for both covered and drive on. Vashon foot ferry needs a climate protector waiting area, not a circus tent.

Additional comments:

Common sense, PO and Kitsap is growing, more people live there and work in Seattle.

Fauntleroy is inadequate. Vashon foot ferry is inconvenient, why do we have to stop and wait everyday at Vashon? Don't make the changes after I retire. Do it now so I can enjoy for the next 20 years.

Comment (received 5/8/2006 via All Aboard):

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

[Illegible] to limit downtown traffic doesn't equal eliminate PO boats. You are pushing us to cars and or longer commutes. Short sighted.

Comment (received 5/8/2006 via All Aboard):

Additional comments:

I am a bike commuter and I ride the passenger ferry...and I have done such since 1990. I know the service is expensive, but as a cyclist, I feel that most people don't realize the many costs that support auto-traffic. In short, I think everyone should pay bridge tolls and highway tolls, so people get a realistic sense of user fees. I'm in support of renovating Colman Dock. The state needs as many alternatives to autos as possible.

Comment (received 5/8/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Mixed use projects elevated @ dock level. Income producing development. Great location, spectacular view.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Abandon Fauntleroy dock/bring all boats into Seattle/save money. What planning in conjunction w/ Viaduct tear down and tunnel concept?

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Visual – social. Waterfront access, green area as part of development. Green roofs/soccer field on top of large building/recreation.

Additional comments:

Design ferries to run on power generated by the vehicles on board.

Comment (received 5/8/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Start with route improvements – THEN decide what docks need. Why do we still have a torn up tent and porta-potties at the PO Dock? Colman needs more amenities while this condition exists?

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Transportation efficiency – e.g. encouragement of walk-ons from all destinations. For example, walk-on to car boat @ Vashon to downtown – avoids bus/car highway capacity issues – not limited to the extremely limited PO boat schedule. Help get the vehicles off regional highways.

Additional comments:

Make walk-on use the highest priority of WSF as opposed to the lowest priority. OK to eliminate the PO boat, but downtown still needs walk on access from all destinations – especially Vashon/Southworth. If we keep the PO boat – lose the torn up circus tent with porta-potties for so-called passenger amenities – how about an actual waiting room?

Comment (received 5/8/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Reduce car ferries, add more passenger only ferries operated by non-union employees. Future improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered? Future improvements should include many more passenger-only ferry accommodations.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Make ferry system part of DOT.

Comment (received 5/8/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Safety could be improved by adding additional overhead or underground access to terminals.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Employee and visitor parking at the terminal should be immediately eliminated and those areas used for holding areas.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

The Southworth route should not be redirected to downtown Seattle since this change will encourage unregulated growth in South Kitsap and damage their environment.

Comment (received 5/8/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

You folks have been wasting our time with crap like these surveys for things that don't ever happen for decades. Where are the Southworth direct service and passenger-only ferries, the smart cards, the signs of a customer-service oriented organization?

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Direct Southworth service. Passenger-only service for Southworth. Guess where I live? You need to do something fast about your offensive, obnoxious traffic crosswalk guards that enjoy making us miss or run for the 4:45 Vashon PO boat, even when no cars are approaching. They are sadistic.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

The hot air expelled from your WSP and King County Police at the crosswalk reeks.

Additional comments:

This has been the most fun I've ever had with your surveys. I can't wait till you do another.

Comment (received 5/8/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

For PO passengers a real bathroom facilities at the terminal for terminal staff. Remedial customer service training – no grumpies or rude service.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

For the PO riders – a real (no tent) building. Safer walkway.

Comment (received 5/8/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

It's much better than it used to be!

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Hotel, bigger holding area.

Additional comments:

Get the Southworth to Seattle run staffed now not 7 years from now.

Comment (received 5/8/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Study pedestrian/auto traffic patterns really carefully! Avoid bottlenecks, poorly designed corners.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

If passenger-only service stays in WSF, please replace the tent. It's done well as a "temporary" structure the last 13 years, but it's getting tired.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

1. Locally generated renewable power to augment PSE.
2. “Green” construction – mandatory? If not, let’s do it anyway. “Green” dock construction – we could be state of the art!
3. Intense negotiation with Metro to increase bus connections/make street side more attractive.

Comment (received 5/8/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Provide opportunity for private vendor operations, make it simpler for them to compete.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Encourage passenger-only, vanpools, bicycle traffic. Do not provide parking for employees – encourage them to use mass transit.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Public safety; aesthetics – make it look appealing – add the waterfront appeal; use sustainable building practices.

Comment (received 5/8/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

More restaurants and shops; more like ferry dock in San Francisco.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Build a real waiting area for the PO boat passengers instead of a tent

Comment (received 5/8/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

The passenger ferry needs some repair work. In a storm water is leaking through the windows.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

KPFF consulting engineers company where I am working can give competitive information about it

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

One more ferry from Dockton Park to Seattle

Comment (received 5/8/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Fix the second elevator – it’s been broken for several months.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Add a direct auto ferry from Southworth to the terminal.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

No smoking anywhere around the terminal.

Comment (received 5/8/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Improve the “look” of the PO boat area, to demonstrate Seattle, King Co. and WA believe in environmentally friendly mass transit, the PO boat! Buy a new boat – same reason

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Better boat (PO); more runs; nicer PO facility; the message – “we care about congestion – take the PO boat!” Allow more bicycles on the PO boat

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Factor in the traffic cost, pollution, and associated costs of people driving, where they could have taken the PO boat.

Additional comments:

Washington says its “GREEN.” Prove it with the PO boat system!!

Comment (received 5/8/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Do passenger only

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

PO service

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Human – PO service

Comment (received 5/8/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

How about a new PO tent. Flushing toilets? A sink?

Additional comments:

How dare you discontinue the passenger only boat? It’s packed every day. We need better PO service.

Comment (received 5/8/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Colman Dock may be the single ugliest facility outside of Siberia.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Add Pier 48 as over water vehicle staging to reduce or eliminate traffic backups on the street.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Coordination with the Viaduct rebuild and seawall rebuild.

Additional comments:

I am a proponent of closing the Fauntleroy Dock and rerouting those ferries to Colman Dock. Although this may lower vehicle capacity to and from Vashon, it will increase public transit options.

Comment (received 5/8/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Cover the passenger-only ferry walking area from street to ferry.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Fourth slip or even 5th slip and take cars from Vashon to Seattle. Increase the number of passenger only runs to Seattle from Vashon.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Cost. Public service convenience.

Comment (received 5/12/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

The ferry workers should be given IQ tests before they are hired. Make sure their IQ is actually higher than 10.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Lower the prices of pastries. Your pastries are good, but they're definitely not worth \$2.50!

Also, a more various selection of juices would be super! I believe that everyone would benefit if you placed more cool looking clocks around. Time is essential! On the top deck, it would be real spiffy if a small estuary was installed for the seagulls to rest and graze. All passengers should get breadcrumbs feed the seagulls upon entrance to ferry. Other than that, you guys are doing okay, I guess.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

You should camouflage the whole boat so it doesn't disrupt the fish and it looks hardcore. Make the ferry silent so fishes ears don't hurt. Deaf fish don't taste as good.

Additional comments:

When kids fall down, it's really funny. C'mon, you know it is. That's why I think you should let kids run on the ferry, cause watching kids experience pain and humiliation makes me happy. You guys have an alright selection of arcade games, but if you could obtain "Blitz" your revenues would increase and so would my fun level.

Comment (received 5/12/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Allow performance audits and fire the incompetents creating waste!!

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Till accountability so toll takers don't rip you/me off for years at a time. Why would it take 3 years to catch these people anyway?

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Don't allow a wasteful project like a tunnel to create impossible traffic blocking the terminal. Also, lobby Mayor Nickels to allow beer at Seahawk tailgates. Provide recycle bins for our cans and bottles.

Comment (received 5/12/2006 via Agency):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Larger waiting room for ticketed customers. Existing space overflows if boat is late.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Improve connections to other forms of transportation – buses, taxis, etc. Improve signage – current situation is confusing. Improve/add equipment/assistance for passengers with luggage.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Waste generation/recycling construction debris. Use of hazmats/chemicals in construction. Noise during construction.

Comment (received 5/12/2006 via Agency):

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider? Put in an auto Colman/Kingston run.

Additional comments:

Full breakfast on BI ferry. Wireless internet on car decks.

Comment (received 5/12/2006 via Agency):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Get the ferries in and out on time.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Anything to keep boats on time.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Reducing number of boats in off-peak times.

Comment (received 5/12/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

- Clean walkway to City and drainage when it rains
- Nicer ramp to ferry
- Cleanup bathroom
- More fresh air in waiting area
- More seating inside and outside
- Need "Do not feed the birds" signs.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Ability to make right turn into ferry at all times.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Impact of rising sea level.

Additional comments:

Please fix taxi problem at Bainbridge dock! Paper or cloth towels in bathroom. Bring back old food vendor – new food is awful.

Comment (received 5/12/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Abandon the "smart card" swipe terminals and project!! Whoever designed them and their terminal location does not commute with WSF! How are commuters @ 12.50 per evening sailing commute going to pass the swipe scans and make the boat?! WSF will be sued for injuries!

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

- Improve walk-on commuter traffic flow and efficiency
- Have a method to tell if you are going to make the boat in a car

-Better passenger ramp for boat ingress/egress

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Passenger safety at Colman Dock terminal security operations (with as much emphasis on transportation efficiencies of everything – study how to move people and vehicles on/off the boat and terminal).

Additional comments:

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Comment (received 5/12/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

- Improve passenger walk-on loading system. Use both sides of the bow instead of just one side.
- Allow liquor to be bought in the terminal and brought on the boat.
- Put in barber and shoe shine facilities in the terminal, manicures, pedicures, could work too.
- Lap dancing?
- Let gambling on boat to reduce passenger fares

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

- Get rid of turnstiles
- Renovate elevated walkway to First Ave. and clean up poop and vomit regularly
- Put speaker to take orders on 1st Ave to order food and pickup in terminal
- Fewer pillars to circumnavigate
- Passenger only service between Kingston and Seattle, maybe even Poulsbo, or the Casino

Additional comments:

The boats are getting dirtier – use the 1-5 am period to clean them.

Comment (received 5/12/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Provide provision for Kingston passenger only ferry.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Provide Kingston passenger only ferry.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Add Kingston passenger only ferry

Additional comments: Passenger only ferries are an essential component of any complete transportation plan and must be included.

Comment (received 5/12/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

First and foremost, cut back on the wasted time standing in line or moving really slowly on and off the ferries. Provide more affordable vendors, with more nutritious offerings. Synch up bus (metro) with ferries.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Provide hotel for those stranded after the last ferry has left.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Partnership w/ Seattle Aquarium and Marine Mammal Conservation and mitigation of environmental degradation. Mass transit to east side – availability and improvement of.

Comment (received 5/12/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

I'm a walk-on commuter from Winslow to an office at 2nd and Seneca. I'd like nicer and easier to 1st avenue and more healthy food choices on the boat and terminal when I have to work late.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Please consider an easy connection to fast mass transit to the airport.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF?

Air and water quality are high for me. Noise is a consideration, too. Current ferries are nice and quiet.

Additional comments:

I want a good quality project for as efficient a cost as possible.

Comment (received 5/12/2006 via All Aboard):

Return mailbox to BI terminal and put one at Seattle.

Comment (received 5/12/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

How about additional personal services – like massage or nails. Commuter comforts is great but drinking isn't always the best way to wait for a boat. Internet café perhaps?

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Consideration of when there are games haven't been evident in the past. Why are we detoured into baseball traffic?

Comment (received 5/12/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Have better passenger loading. Both doors need to be open, wider passage on to boat to avoid bottleneck. Currently it's a nightmare walking on the Bainbridge boat – no ventilation, doors malfunction, rude terminal workers.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered

- Safe bicycle loading
- Safe place for bicycles to wait, out of weather
- More bathrooms in terminal
- Better facilities for car passengers waiting in lot – bathrooms are scary
- Better access from car waiting lot to terminal
- Approach from 1st Ave. needs improvement; keep sidewalk clean on overpass, patrol for panhandlers

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Ventilation inside terminal. It's hot as hell waiting for the boat. Seems to be a hangout for drug sellers, drunks, and thugs – more patrol for passenger safety.

Comment (received 5/12/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Add additional buildings where the car waiting lines are located so drive-ons stay dry and the terminal can make extra \$\$ leasing retail above. Also – structure the ferry fees to further benefit monthly pass users. These people merit the reduced fare and stabilize ferry receivables.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

A much brighter architecture that maximizes the beautiful views that the location offers. Commercial space rental is the key driver in keeping ferry rider costs economical. Offer a yearly pass at a substantial \$\$ discount.

Comment (received 5/12/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Color code monthly passes say Bremerton one color, Bainbridge another so you don't have to tell the ticket monitor which boat you're getting on every single day of the year. Have somebody checking passes on the weekend so you don't have to stand in the line so long that you miss the boat. Bigger month print on the passes.

Comment (received 5/12/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Get ride of the turnstiles – how thin do you think people are? Also, you might want to incorporate actual commuters on your planning board. Would you want the Seafair Pirates to design the space shuttle – I don't think so.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

- Better crowd control
- Open a casino
- Maybe a holding area under water?
- How about a separate holding area for cranky commuters?

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Marine mammal displacement

Comment (received 5/12/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Clean bathrooms. Nicer waiting area. Allow more time for boarding (easier and quicker vessel entry).

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Waterfront pedestrian access. Do not create a huge parking lot – Hwy 305 cannot handle additional traffic. Do not create huge waiting areas. Create small foot ferries from various spots on Seattle waterfront to Kitsap.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Impact on traffic.

Additional comments:

Why do I have to mail this back and not hand it in at a collection point? [Note: This comment was put in a comment box]

Comment (received 5/12/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Design should include ability to load and unload vessels using two simultaneous gang planks. Adopt BC ferry loading/unloading system. Need vastly improved passenger screening and security systems/procedures – offer choice between special security pass and actual luggage/backpack screening. Consider backscatter screening.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Cars should be mechanically screened and sniffed. They should also be searched, at least randomly. Need wider walkways.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Add Kingston passenger only ferry

Additional comments:

Passenger only ferries are an essential component of any complete transportation plan and must be included.

Comment (received 5/9/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Now: Not squeeze all walk-on passengers through a 6' wide double door (the 2nd 6' wide double door is broken and has been for months). Future: See how Hong Kong passenger ferries get lots of people on and off quickly. Consider that.

Comment (received 5/9/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Improve passenger ramps so more people can disembark at a time. Bike storage and lockers at Colman. Walkway under Viaduct is awful and needs replacement.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Better seating in waiting area; more and quicker passenger ferries to Suquamish/Seattle, Kingston/Seattle, Bremerton/Seattle. Better food service on the boats!

Comment (received 5/9/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Try this on for size. The kitchen (galley) on the ferry closes ~10pm. Food shops at Colman Dock close by 9 pm. Net effect? No food service for passengers traveling on late ferries from Colman Dock. Either, 1) Leave galley open later and into the night, or 2) ask one concession vendor at Colman Dock to stay open late, say until 11:30 or midnight, specially on Friday, Saturday, Sunday nights. Option 1 is preferred.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Replace McDonalds with a more healthy restaurant.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Please stop the Coast Guard "escort" boats (with machine gun). My God, is it really needed? What a military brain fart. What does it achieve? I object to the violent context – machine gun, arm and loaded, with Marine on hand. What is with this WWII? And I object the environment impact the boats put on the Sound. The ferry is already a significant polluter on the Sound (oil into water, and emissions into the air). Let's reduce the impact on the Sound.

Additional comments:

Please, please, please...Revise your Seattle-Bainbridge sailing schedule to a realistic time frame. In the past year or so, it seems all commuter sailings are chronically late. Get it right on the next schedule update. The irony is that WSF publishes sailings schedules 4 times per year, yet the schedule for the Bainbridge run never changes, yet it is a very busy run, and you need to correct sailing times. Allow more time for commuter times, i.e., 7-9 am 4-6 pm M-F. I am sick and tired of hearing the 2nd mate ask passengers "hurry" off the boat in order to meet the

sailing schedule. That is your problem. The boat is full of people, and you have a 5' wide plank? Get a clue. You need a second plank and a wider walkway (on Bainbridge). Bottom line: The Bainbridge run makes WSF money, it's the only profitable ferry run, correct? Please treat us accordingly.

Comment (received 5/9/2006 via All Aboard):

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Impact on wildlife – how best to mitigate negative impact.

Additional comments:

Do not automate ticket sales! I believe that this is already in the works – not only would this have the obvious impact of taking away jobs – it would also create a less enjoyable experience for passengers. Additionally, self-service systems rarely work and are always slower for customers.

Additional comments:

Reminder: 6 light bulbs out in women's restroom on Tacoma – for weeks.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Decent bathrooms! ADA and lots of wash basins to wash hands.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Separate ball game traffic from commuter traffic. Commuters should not have to drive by stadium traffic to get to boat. Ball game people should not have to deal with ferry congestion.

2. Should be able to phone ahead to find out if specific ferries are full such as 5:30 pm to Bremerton.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Better restrooms. New card readers – need mounted on right side for motorcycles (left side requires motorcyclists to reach over with right hand/left hand needs to hold clutch).

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Separate entrance for carpools, vanpool, motorcycles, bicycles. More booths open during heavy volumes. More off road holding – get cars off the streets.

Comment (received 5/9/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Improved access to ferries and exit from terminal. Improved waiting area for limos (in front of terminal).

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Air conditioning; more seating; slow lane on and off the ferry for disabled (and tourists!)

Comment (received 5/16/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Keep the restrooms clean – that shouldn't require an EIS! Provide comfortable seating. Make the loading and unloading process quicker.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Reduce the bottlenecks in the loading/unloading process:

- Doorways too narrow or have obstruction
- Ferry should have loading from both sides
- The ramp for the Bainbridge Ferry (portion lowered to the boat) is embarrassing! And slow.
- Improve entry and exit for vehicles so gridlock doesn't occur on busy periods (Friday afternoon, Mariner games, etc).

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Impacts on aquatic life – salmon, other fish, shellfish, etc

Additional comments:

Thanks.

Comment (received 5/9/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Bainbridge/Seattle passengers, until recently, could wait outside of the sliding doors. Now, for some reason, we cannot. As the weather moves into summer, the inside of the passenger building turns into a sauna with the crowds. Please bring back outside waiting (perhaps a better gate to the ramp is all that's needed). This is my suggestion for now, not for long-term rebuilding.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Also, in the new plan, please have outdoor waiting available in good weather. When the weather is good, it's a great way to wait for the boat. Thanks!

Comment (received 5/9/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

First thank you for more than 60 years of the best possible service! And a lifetime memories of for this N. westerner. You've been a great part of my life here and my exploration of this ethereal area. The Puget Sound is a unique and precious body of water that enriches all the land masses around it.

-Don't you think that in this continuing "post" modern age that we as a community might consider that best possible role we as people can assume is as conservators of this jewel of a planet?

-These new improvements and reconstructions could they consider the health of the Puget Sound?

The well-being of wildlife? An attitude of responsibility, consideration, and education about and for this rare and precious place?

-That is what I would like to continue to see. I love the murals and photos of the history of WSF!

Additional comments:

I read your article – well, the article in the WSF newsletter (November 2005) about the deer investigating the Westport ferry terminal on the northwest end of “could-be” island. I think they are to leave the overly developed island to reach the Olympics which they can see but not reach. What do you think? Too Disney for you or what? Is anyone interested? At all?

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Teach customer relations to employees. The attitudes of some ticket takers, one in particular, is terrible. If the ferry was run like a private company he would have been fired long ago!

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

You spent millions updating the terminal and building another slip already. You need to better justify this additional expense. Money should be spent bringing new ferries online first.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

If there is too much growth projected in the future, WSF should be studying feasibility of building an additional terminal instead of enlarging the Colman Dock in an area where traffic is already terrible during rush hour.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

-McDonalds upstairs, too.

-Airports have arrival/departure displays why not have one, too

-Please stop the “jazz” music instead play elevator music or something. Jazz makes my blood pressure rise!

-Have area where people eat and on walls display old pictures of piers and Seattle

-Large viewing windows everywhere – blast resistant of course

-Ferry book souvenir shop on tourist season??

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Sky lights save on electricity; waterfall/fountain in center on eating area. Have a monorail from the Space Needle to ball parks to ferry terminal [drawing] – add more locations later, let rail pay for itself.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Keeping panhandlers and homeless off of pedestrian thoroughfares such as the walk between the ferry terminal under the viaduct to First Ave. A terrorist could pose as a homeless with a large box and blow up someone. Also it would brighten up Seattle as tourist do use this too.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

More windows. More speed passes.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Wider tramways for passengers.

Additional comments:

Very happy so far, would like Starbucks on ferries.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Lower the fares!! So we can afford the amenities. You keep jacking the rates up you won't need the additional slip. Lower the fares!

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Lower fares!! Be treated as a public transportation facility, not a business to make money from the working poor.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Lower the fares, so that we won't be so upset that we are tearing our hair out and throwing our stuff around from frustration, there by destroying our environment. LOWER THE FARES!!

Additional comments:

LOWER THE FARES!! We don't care about beautification.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

I have been riding for seven years and most people don't stay long in the terminal. I suggest that be comfortable and the appointments simple. I make this commute every day and, like everyone else, I just pass through.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Minimize building and parking lot footprint as much as possible! Keep the project simple and functional. Please don't try and be "world class," it's a transit project. Minimize cost. I'm usually someone who votes for tax increase but remember that this building will be built with public dollars and every project has cost overruns. Don't sell naming rights.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Don't cut corners on environmental issues, it's the only planet we get. Perhaps pave with a non-macadam surface, that's toxic stuff.

Additional comments:

Just because you can does not mean you should. Keep things simple, functional, pleasant to the eye, and doable. Most of all, don't drag this out for years and years.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Work with Seattle Transit w/ bus connections during heavy commuting times and ferry delays. Improve ferry schedules especially 3:00 pm run – for an eight hour day. If you dock close to 6 am then start work at 6:30 – eight hours is three o'clock then a 3:30 pm ferry would be more reasonable. (Runs 4:50 am Bremerton, 5:20 am Bainbridge.)

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

If considering adding an additional ferry on Bremerton how about a “passenger-only” ferry. It was used well during commuter runs.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Work with Seattle Transit especially during months where fog delays arrival. The buses won't wait.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Why is there a vacant store front? Could/would an Asian/Mexican or Italian food shop do well?

Additional comments:

Ferry schedule – the 1st ferry to Seattle is 4:50 – arrival at 6:00 possible to arrive at work 6:30 – 8hrs = 3:00. Is it possible to delay the 3:00 sailing from Seattle to Bremerton 3:20 or 3:30? That would cause only a 20 minute delay for the other ferries i.e. 4:40, 5:50, 6:00. When WSF had a foot ferry from 3:30 – 4:10 there was standing room only. Is WSF interested in a foot ferry? Kitsap Ferry can't keep passengers because of constantly changing schedules and high prices.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Always have galley service. I think it's not fair to only have galley service on Bainbridge runs. Bainbridge Island and Bremerton should be treated equally. Cleaner boats on Bremerton runs.

Additional comments:

Does it honestly really matter what we think? If everyone says DO NOT DO THIS project will you REALLY stop? No – you'll do as you wish anyways so why waste paper? You've already proven to us, you'll do what you wish. Please feel free to call w/ any questions or to tell me if I am wrong. I'll be waiting.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

-Shorter (automated) ticket purchase process

- Better access to public transportation off-street/bus/taxi depot
- Larger restroom facility
- Load/offload passengers on both sides of vessel during peak commuter hours

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

- All listed (greater capacity)
- New loading/unloading ramps (increased passenger traffic flow) support load/unload from vessel as described above.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Economic impact, commuter quality of life

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Friendlier ticket agents – smiles and a pleasant “hello” cost \$0.00. Reduce delay in lowering the passenger ramps after the ferry arrives. Vehicles usually start moving well before the ramp comes out of the “up” position.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Coordinate with metro to have the #194 bus stop at the dock. This would help those who are going to the airport.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Allow street performers on board again

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Ticket taker

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Don't feed the seagulls!

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

“Last call for _____” You have one minute to board.” I would like a consistent last call with amount of time to departure.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Page 1 already tells the problem and what's needed.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Wake management.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Have lane for pass holder to bypass lines waiting to buy tickets. Have better lanes for passengers coming off the ferry to quickly exit the building without going around tables, etc. Letting passengers on the boat at the same times as bicycles, motorcycles.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Easier access for passengers to be picked up at ferry building. Put ferry system back in the DOT people who ride ferries are not driving on pavement they are being taxed for while riding the waterway.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Reduce food prices so that they are comparable to similar businesses. For example, the \$1 menu for McDonalds includes double cheeseburgers. That appears to be true everywhere except the terminal and one other location. Reducing food and beverage prices would make the ferry terminal more family friendly.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

Additional comments:

To operate WSF between Bremerton and Seattle with added crossing, neat and tidy ferries, and arriving and departure times that meet the schedule as posted should be the goal.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Don't stop letting people go out on the ramp to wait at the gate for the ferry. It is too hot and stuffy to wait inside.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

More frequent runs – open all toll booths esp. @ rush hour – area for busses and cab-limos dropoff

– no street parking on Alaskan Way – Just tear down the viaduct. Casino, game room, movies, tolls on the freeway, dinner, fine dining.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

As above. More smaller boats, load and unload faster inbetween passenger boats. Worker express. Have a casino or game room. Concerts on the boat.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues

should WSF consider?

A bridge; a bus from Bremerton to Port Orchard; who can afford to visit Seattle.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

More visible signs of ferry workers cleaning the boats. The boats get really dirty inside and I think the workers should be cleaning them rather than resting between dockings and while boats are in service.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Immediate repair of walk off ramp (middle ramp). It feels like it could fall apart.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Larger and better washroom facilities; improve waiting areas; pedestrian service is already good-courteous and prompt

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Install a small shelter for bikes at each slip; schedule cashier breaks for other than rush hour

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

NONE. You just spent millions on it. Maintain existing facilities and QUIT RAISING FARES to get more money to waste.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

We would like to be able to turn into the terminal from both directions on Alaskan Way, and to exit the dock and proceed either north or south.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Lighted large sign at entrance to dock or before turned on and indicating the lane prepaid vehicles only should move into. May cars, not regulars, do not know, until too late, that they are in wrong lane. This backs up traffic and holds up prepaid vehicles while they try to move to other lane.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

There should be a better system for vehicles getting into line on Alaskan Way for ferries. Too many late comers trying to cut in line. Need better system to get from toll booth to line on dock. Bremerton and Bainbridge vehicles cross path of the other.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Food establishments beyond the ticket taker – so once inside you have an option. A more fully stocked convenience store (like Figs) would be ideal. Split four lines into cash/pass only and

credit card only.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Covered pedway to first. Consider separate entrance for Bainbridge to Bremerton for cars. More ticket takers for cars. Connect paid portion of walk-on terminal to paid car lot area.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Impact to sea lions, whales, ducks, eagles, etc. I see no wildlife impact statement listed.

Additional comments:

The entire project suffers from too little too late. Really an '08-'10 window should be the aim.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Re-configure the car entrance. I have been commuting by car to/from Bremerton for 6+ years and have had many a bad time trying to get into the que, especially when Safeco Field is having a game. I would tear out the whole entrance and start over. The fountain is nice but in the way. Sometimes it takes an hour to from downtown into the que, because you make right turns from southbound Alaskan Way off-limits, there's game letting out, and it's a long weekend. I have sat in line for what seems an eternity, only to get to an empty ferry lot! It's insane.

Additional comments:

Get rid of the sour-pusses at the ticket booths. I think a few of your ticketing people are not appropriate people or need training in customer service. I have plenty of experience with bad encounters to know whether some of them need customer service training, or should be transferred to a place where they don't have to talk to the public.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Wi-Fi access; broadband access.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Heard rumors of placing a hotel at Colman Dock. This would only create the congestion you are currently generating to eliminate with this project. If the rumors are true please remove them from your plans. If not please do not let people pressure you into a bad idea. The focus of Colman Dock should remain transit. Your recent improvements have significantly improved the pending arrival/departure of ferries. Keep in mind "more is not better"!

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

I would like to see an integrated passenger only ferry pier as part of the improvements. Using passenger only ferries to augment commuting periods and replace most auto runs during non-peak periods has the potential to reduce costs. Allowing private companies to operate these

ferries should also be considered as part of this program. From a design standpoint, traffic entry/departure needs to be examined. The pedestrian sky bridge should be modified to allow pedestrians better to the last side of Alaskan Way.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Consider noise (both during and post construction), the effect of new lighting and the changes to local business climate.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Because waterfront is so valuable there should be no parking at the terminals. Solution is a free shuttle bus to a park and ride a mile +/- away.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Expand passenger waiting area to accommodate walk on increases expected. Wi-Fi hookups in the terminal and on board Bremerton vessels ASAP!

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Need to be coordinated with Seattle plans for renovation/replacement and/or disposal of Alaskan Way viaduct. Will directly impact access/egress to/from ferry terminal to downtown/hwy 99/ I-5.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Earthquake proofing of dock facilities and vehicle waiting area as well as main terminal in case of catastrophic event. As a regular commuter, I'd not want to be "stranded" in Bremerton and need to get home to Seattle, should an earthquake occur during the day.

Comment (received 5/11/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Don't know as I never take ferry to or from Colman Dock.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Again – no idea – as I don't go to Colman Dock.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Suggest you obtain opinions/advice from environmental experts.

Comment (received 5/11/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Model the operations at Sydney Australia's Harbor Quay.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Adding rail service to the terminal area.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Noise

Additional comments:

I very rarely use the downtown terminal. I have been to Sydney several times during the past two years and am very impressed by the number of people and locations served all with a high degree of quality. I'm certain other examples exist, perhaps Hong Kong.

Comment (received 5/11/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Begin Southworth to Colman Dock ferry service.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Additional dock for increased Southworth to Colman auto ferries.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

-Plasma/LCD display panels showing loading instructions, time to next arrival/departure, pertinent traveler notices, travel videos for events/things to do at destination

-Modern seating

-Automated ticketing (like Wash DC Metro, BART)

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Current improvements were a huge step forward. More sit down restaurant space, make ferry terminal a dinner destination. Perhaps sweeping Elliott Bay view like SeaTac International food court area.

Comment (received 5/10/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

More space; look at possibility of traffic access from/to the Alaskan Way Viaduct?

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Extend the dock seaward/make entire dock-structure 2-3 levels/add provisions for future intermodal mass-transit connections/provisions for much more foot ferries

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues

should WSF consider?

Design for earthquake and tsunami protection

Additional comments:

Better readerboards – visibility for far off so that passengers can see what boats are leaving/delays/etc

Comment (received 5/11/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Rain protection for bus boarders

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Increased fuel burn and traffic congestion due to re-routing Fauntleroy-bound traffic to Pier 52.

Additional comments:

Southworth to Pier 52 doubles the boat ride time and is terribly inconvenient people going south of town.

Comment (received 5/11/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Begin Southworth Colman Dock service to coincide with tolls on the Narrows bridge. I believe would increase if there is a direct route.

Comment (received 5/11/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Improve passenger flow and capacity

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Passenger only service to Port Orchard, Bremerton, Bainbridge and Kingston.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Downtown Seattle doesn't need more vehicle traffic. The region needs functional, integrated and efficient transit system.

Comment (received 5/11/2006 via All Aboard):

Additional comments:

The Southworth/Fauntleroy run is essential for myself and the 25 other Tukwila commuters. Please keep vanpool.

Comment (received 5/11/2006 via All Aboard):

Additional comments:

If you plan to consider routing Southworth traffic to Colman dock you should poll those

residents who commute and find out what percentage of riders actually go to that area as opposed to W. Seattle, Georgetown, Boeing, Renton, etc. before you consider this. In addition the idea of routing more traffic downtown while the viaduct reconstruction is either unknown or under construction seems a bad idea. Rather than moving all service from Southworth to Colman, logical alternatives might be:

- Encourage more use of vanpools from Southworth and Vashon to Fauntleroy to decrease single passenger/vehicle passengers traffic
- Have boats scheduled so that part of peak traffic boats go Vashon-Fauntleroy/Southworth-Fauntleroy and others go Vashon-Colman/Southworth-Colman. That proposal might be more widely supported by both Vashon and Southworth.

Comment (received 5/11/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Better traffic flow; increased capacity for holding area; better/more retail/food

Additional comments:

State should consider/study the impact of better ferry service will have on overall growth in Puget Sound Area. Ferries can decrease/improve traffic congestion along I-5 corridor by diffusing traffic on I-5.

Comment (received 5/11/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Allow acoustic musicians to play (relaxing) music for change (Busking). More buses out front.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Using tidal energy to generate electricity for the terminal. Also a large wind turbine.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

I would like to see a serious attempt to use bio-diesel or hydrogen to power the ferries.

Additional comments:

The number one thing I would like to see is a PO boat going from Southworth to Colman Dock all day now not in the year 3000!

Comment (received 5/11/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

It would be great if there were more ticket booths, more stalls in the bathrooms, and more ferry runs between Seattle and Bremerton.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

I think the walkway that goes beneath the Viaduct should be taken into consideration. There needs to be an alternate route for pedestrians and walk-on passengers if construction for a new viaduct or underground tunnel takes place.

Comment (received 5/19/2006 via e-mail):

I'm not sure if Peter has given you official comment for the EIS scoping process for the Colman Dock, but please consider this comment from Councilmember Peter Steinbrueck. Councilmember Steinbrueck is interested in siting an open-air summertime concert facility within the Colman Dock project.

Comment (received 5/21/2006 via e-mail):

Thanks very much for the summary on the ferry project. I had found the briefing at the PSRC's offices helpful as well. I did leave my comments at the meeting, which are influenced both by my condo location above the ferry terminal and my interest in the viaduct project. I can appreciate the need to generate private capital for other development and amenities, but I would hate to see the city raise height limits on the site which would not only block my view, but also run counter to the effort to open up the view vistas of the waterfront by putting the viaduct underground. Thanks for putting me on the distribution list. These briefings are well done and helpful.

Comment (received 5/22/2006 via e-mail):

I understand the deadline was Friday but decided to request consideration of the following comments. perhaps not as part of the official scoping record.

As a regular commuter on this run I have two concerns. There are a few VERY loud motorcycles that I'm am afraid are damaging my hearing. Is there an ordinance that is not being enforced about this? It is especially loud when they are on the boat, everyone is close and the motorcycles are amplified by the ferry shell.

My second concern regards meeting transportation needs without harming people's health by polluting the environment. There are a lot of bicyclists now and will probably be more. The State could take advantage of this and encourage it my providing better waiting areas, access, and better and more parking for bikes on the ferries. Sometimes it seems WSF's goal is moving cars and truck rather than helping people get where they need to go. Those are not the same thing. However, WSF does seem to do well at promoting vanpools.

For the Coleman Dock project, I hope the agency will improve stormwater treatment and generally do more to protect water quality and the environment in the future. I also would like the agency to reduce noise levels and better accommodate non-fossil fuel burning commuters. I know there were plans at one time to reduce the adverse effects of the over-water structure of the dock and I would support that. Finally, I'd like to thank the ferry workers who are polite to the bicyclists!

Thank you for consideration of these comments.

Comment (received 5/19/2006 via All Aboard):

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Ferry Terminal at Coleman Dock.

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?
I believe ticket sales for regular fares should be decentralized; like postage stamps the tickets

should be available in books of 10 to 20 tickets at local food and drug stores as well as other locations. I believe the tickets should be like postage stamps as well in that they do not expire, they simply represent an amount of money that is equivalent to the cost of the fare. When the fares go up people can buy the equivalent of the difference in price and pay accordingly as we do when postage goes up.

The current ticket sales is a total waste of time for all who wait in line; there is no need for more than one ticket sales person if one can buy one, two or more tickets at a time. A trip to New York will reveal a really efficient and customer friendly train ticketing system. People simply add an amount of money on a card, like a starbucks card, and the card is read and the amount of fare is deducted as the person passes their card through the turnstile.

This may be what is planned with the turnstile but many of us are really annoyed with the placement of the turnstiles so close to the boarding doors. This spacing does not allow for any holding area for passengers who arrive early. Please don't treat us like cattle; this feels really awful!!!

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?
How can it be more clear that more boat runs are needed?? The capacity runs far behind the obvious need. Why not more boat runs? It seems absurd to me that people have to wait consistently for hours in line to board a ferry. If the passengers are there, run another boat.

What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?
Traffic, traffic, traffic. I have heard that people wanting to board the boat to Bremerton sometimes get held up on Alaskan Way and cannot get into the holding area even though the Bremerton holding space and boat has plenty of space to accommodate more vehicles. I think there needs to be separate access and staging areas for each destination.

Again, thank you for asking.

Comment (received 5/18/2006 via e-mail):

I was on an advisory committee in early 1990s for the Wash StateFerry's proposed rebuild of their Colman dock. From what I now read about the waterfront proposals, according to Seattle Times, Real Change, and The Weekly, there is reference to condos, hotels on the waterfront. Of course, none of the writers define "waterfront", and that leads me to a question that Virginia Richmond and Benella Caminetti of the Seattle League of Women Voters kept raising at the advisory group when WashDOT and WA State Ferry talked about residences, hotels, entertainment centers. My memory is that they stated that the State Constitution says development on the waterfront (shorelines of the state) can only be "water related". In the past two weeks I've talked with the following people to get some clarification about what type of development is allowed: Seattle League of Women Voters Land Use Committee Chair Karen Kane Cary Moon, Landscape Architect who has a proposal for redevelopment of the waterfront/Alaska Viaduct Irene Wall, neighborhood activist on waterfront development Robert Scully, City of Seattle, Department of Planning and Development.

Robert sent me these facts:

The Downtown Harborfront 1 (DH1) zoning applies to the shoreline area of the waterfront (west of Alaskan Way). The following is a summary of the DH1 zoning from the Land Use chapter of the Waterfront Background Report (http://www.cityofseattle.net/DPD/Planning/Central_Waterfront/Background/default.asp#background):

"Downtown Harborfront 1 (DH1) Zone and Urban Harborfront (UH)

Shoreline Environment

Regulations of the Urban Harborfront shoreline environment and the corresponding Downtown Harborfront 1 base zone support policy objectives and serve to reinforce the existing physical form and character of the harborfront. These combined designations apply to the largest shoreline portion of the Central Waterfront west of Alaskan Way, extending from S. Jackson Street northward to Bay Street.

Intent. The purpose of the UH Environment is to encourage economically viable water-dependent uses to meet the needs of waterborne commerce, facilitate the revitalization of the Downtown waterfront, provide opportunities for public access and recreational enjoyment of the shoreline, preserve and enhance elements of historic and cultural significance and preserve views of Elliott Bay and the land forms beyond.

Uses.

- Other than water-dependent uses, permitted uses include retail, restaurants, offices above wharf level, and parks.
- Residential and hotel uses are prohibited.
- Principal use parking is prohibited; but accessory parking for water-dependent or water related uses is allowed."

Water-Dependent Incentive – Council Conditional Use. Allows an increase in height to 60' or 75' and an increase in lot coverage to 65 percent for major water-dependent uses.

The City's draft Waterfront Concept Plan is not encouraging new residential development on the shoreline (west of Alaskan Way). It does have some recommendations that may encourage residential development east of Alaskan Way where residential development is already permitted. Any proposal for new residential development along the shoreline would require a change in the DH1 zoning.

-Robert
City Planning Division
CityDesign Program
Department of Planning and Development
City of Seattle
206.233.3854
robert.scully@seattle.gov

Please enter this entire email message as my comment about the draft EIS to be published in 2008. The scope of issues must include the existing land use zones including the above

language from the City's draft Waterfront Concept Plan. I learned from the 1992? advisory group that the need for the project stems from destruction of piers from a saltwater "critter"(wood borer?). Facts about the projected capacity will be important. Options to consider should include the "mix" of passenger only ferries and vehicle ferries. I think the EIS should describe incentives to increase foot passengers and decrease vehicles on daily service. Thank you.

I would appreciate an email reply that my comments were received by your office by the May 19 deadline. I am sending this to you at 9:18 PM, Thursday, May 18, 2006

Comment (received 5/18/2006 via e-mail):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

I'm a Bremerton-Seattle weekday commuter and spend most of my time at Colman Dock ("CD") just zipping through the terminal. The terminal improvements are great! It's a much nicer place to zip through these days!

The piped-in Muzak that y'all just started playing is awful. Getting rid of it would be a big improvement. It's especially annoying when you're standing outside in the holding area waiting for the boat. Many of us just hate it. I wish more people would write to tell you that, but they probably won't.

The turnstile things are too narrow. It's probably too late to do anything about that, eh? We need more recycle bins in the terminal (and on the boats, too, but I know that's outside the scope of this request for comments). If you enter the terminal from the sliding doors that face the Duwamish side of the terminal, having that first row of new seats so close to the gizmos that define the ticketing area is awkward. Any chance of moving them? What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered? Hanging gourds to encourage Purple Martin nesting would be nice. I don't know if the birds would cooperate, though.

WSF will study a number of factors... (written in as part of comment)

Impact on animals. Impact on humans having to breathe second-hand smoke as they walk on the outside of the terminal to the pedestrian overpass. It gets really, really, awful. Aren't there enough doors to the outside to say no smoking, you're violating the 25-foot rule?

These probably aren't the type of comments you were looking for, but they're what's been on. No need to add me to the mailing list.

Comment (received 5/22/2006 via Agency):

Thank you for the opportunity to assist WSDOT in its scoping for the Environmental Impact Statement for the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project at Colman Dock. Our comments are intended to help create the best possible environmental information for decision-makers so that they are able to select the best alternative, improve air quality, protect the public health and comply with state and federal Clean Air Acts. We have two categories of comments: general concerns pertaining to air quality and environmental compliance, and detailed concerns pertaining to the content of the EIS.

General Concerns:

1. The areas of concern in air quality in the Puget Sound region are:

- Fine particulates, (PM_{2.5})
- Toxic air pollutants, including those associated with diesel exhaust
- Ozone
- Climate change
- Visibility

The focus of the EIS should reflect these concerns.

2. This project needs to be analyzed in context with the other existing and planned projects in the area, e.g. the Alaska Way Viaduct.

3. The study area needs to be as large as possible because of the regional nature of the ferry service and the location of alternate routes, e.g. the Fauntleroy, and Edmonds Kingston ferries.

4. Construction period impacts should receive particular consideration because they pose as large or larger threat to air quality and public health as operational impacts.

5. Compliance with transportation conformity regulations does not confer compliance with or serve as mitigation to achieve compliance with other environmental requirements, such as the National Environmental Policy Act or the State Environmental Policy Act.

Detailed Concerns:

1. Carbon Monoxide emissions have been steadily declining and are not a significant air quality or public health concern. Accordingly, the EIS should minimize analysis of CO and consider using a cost efficient methodology such as WSDOT's WASIST screening tool to determine compliance with transportation conformity regulations.

2. Given the location of the ferry terminal and the composition of the ridership the EIS should thoroughly examine the impacts of different mode splits on mobile source air pollution. The EIS should also examine the impact of site design modifications, e.g. precisely how close transit service vehicles are located to ferry vessel pedestrian entrances/exits, on mode splits and thus mobile source air pollution.

3. Marine related issues need thorough examination including the emissions from any water-bourn construction equipment, emissions from dredge spoils or fill materials, emissions from ferry vessels and emissions from marine vessels affected by ferry terminal construction and operation.

4. The information in the sections on Energy, Indirect and Cumulative Effects, and Transportation should be used to improve and explain the section on Air Quality. For example, the construction equipment and fuel consumption information in the Energy section can be used to analyze the construction period air quality impacts in the Air Quality section.

5. Since the construction period is six years the construction period emissions must be

included in the transportation conformity determination.

6. The discussion of mitigation measures should include state of the art practices, new technology and operational activities as well as existing requirements and agreements, such as our MOA on fugitive dust control. We welcome an opportunity to meet with WSDOT and the EIS consultants to discuss these concerns and also to discuss potential mitigation measures. The Clean Air Agency can provide technical information, e.g. studies on the health effects of diesel particulate matter, background on our activities, e.g. Diesel Solutions, and potential mitigation measures, e.g. reducing idling, to assist WSDOT in meeting its environmental obligations.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment. We appreciate WSDOT's willingness to consider a range of approaches for addressing the environmental issues associated with this project.

Comment (received 5/21/2006 via e-mail):

Thank you for allowing me this opportunity to comment. I enjoyed your Washington State Ferries (WSF) open house held April 2006. During my review I had studied your purpose and scope for "today and tomorrow". My comments of your project teams 21st century visions could include appreciations of our past. I would like to ask you to look ahead and include new ways to preserve our past and future maritime transportation legends. I am specifically asking you to create a lasting dock endowment or trust at Coleman Dock to implement this idea. So that, today and tomorrow, we can celebrate, honor, and capture our forefathers past 100 years and perhaps the next 100 years of community legendary accomplishments. Your WSF planning opportunity towards growth and re-development may never come again. There is a need today to present our history within your privately Co-development ideas. Therefore, I have included attachments and previously submitted draft designs. We are asking you to include these documents within your future reviews and studies of the proposed draft WSF Seattle Ferry Terminal project.

I feel that a lasting State owned tract related to leasing the site for private development and management of two structural towers, pedestals, and the Kalakala can prove to be the best use and value of the property. The endowment and land lease concept is similar to what has already been done and proven to be highly successful. Many legal and design issues must be reviewed regarding such a public-private venture with WSF and Co-Developers, but I feel it should be allowed to be studied within your further public process before being excluded.

Two past public-private projects within our 20th century should be mentioned Specifically mentioning 1951 and former Governor Langlie. And, the University of Washington (UW) and their roots related to the Metropolitan Tract have truly shaped the heart of the City. And, since 1951 your WSF ferry system has shaped the heart of our waterways transportation system. These pioneering "pasts" are legendary, and are assured to continue as legends perpetually. Our forefathers community visions have not only created a precedence, but continue to inspire us towards making our community a much better place to live, work, and play. The wisdom of the past can be used again within your WSF future Seattle ferry Terminal Project today.

Two examples from our "pioneering past" include,

1) The 1894 lasting endowment for the University of Washington (UW) and, the waves of developments for Metropolitan Tract (MT). By year 2014 not only all the land will still be owned by the State but all permanent improvements as well. Most of all, which was paid for with private funds and privately managed for over 100 years.

2) The WSF 1951 acquisitions from the Puget Sound Navigation Company (PSN). Today, WSF has grown to be the largest operating ferry system in the world.

It is difficult to project the next generation's legends within your WSF visions of "today and tomorrow". But, there have been many profound past economic, social, and community impacts effecting 100's of millions of people from around the world. Yet, the WSF history is immeasurable of its potential future accumulated shared community profits related to this idea. My comments are only to enhance your timely responsibilities, and to help WSF to create the highest and best uses envisioned within the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project. It is my honor to comment today because it will be too late tomorrow. I hope that you can find a way to review and include such past legendary accomplishments within the WSF future development processes of "today and tomorrow".

Please reference the book written by Neal O. Hines, titled "Denny's Knoll", page 284-285. There are many historical public records that I would suggest for the use of their wisdom, only as a guide, towards developing a modern business method and legal process to develop another great perpetual land use plan. Please consider a similar Public-Private idea using the Kalakala in your WSF future Seattle Ferry Terminal – Coleman Dock project.

Note: It is highly difficult to measure our past community values past on to us from the 20th century Historic properties, such as, the Olympic Hotel, Smith Tower, Space Needle, or even past PSN, WSF, and potential future of the Kalakala idea today. But, please make an effort to review these comments, and consider a private Co-Development, non-competitive bid (request for proposal), alternative elements submitted today for the Kalakala.

Seattle Ferry Terminal Project – Comment Form
Please include me on your mailing list.

WSF will study a number of factors during the environmental impact statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Land use: Perpetual Land Lease from the WSF and/or City for a non-competitive bid, or request for proposal related to preserving the Kalakala under a private Co-Development project. The Kalakala is listed on the Washington Heritage Register of Historic Places and the National Register of Historic Places. The proposed long-term public land lease at Coleman Dock would provide a perpetual open public space for viewing, generate self-sustaining revenues from the graving dock multi-use pedestals and interior space of the Kalakala, and the competitive bid private developed twin towers designed on top of the pedestals.

Seattle Ferry Terminal Project Improvement: WSF Seattle Ferry Terminal – Coleman Dock project to include: public open space, five-star terminal, private Co-Developments via long

term land lease (State owned upon expiration of land lease) to include; waterscapes, outdoor/indoor viewing and entertainment events, parking stalls, concerts, interior space of the Kalakala; historical maritime museum, transportation exhibitions, art and cultural, five-star dining, special event space, concessions, and transportation themed interactive IMAX type theater. The Kalakala pedestals would be designed to include two twin towers for waterfront commercial alternative space uses; such as, Side-A) leisure industry: condominiums and hotel, and/or Side-B) offices, entertainment, and other themed tourism attractions sub-leases.

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities?

Operations Improvements:

The WSF operations can be improved by consider reviewing the MT and using it as a “sample Kalakala lease plan”. Our forefathers pinned down the principles for a successful perpetual lease, and WSF and Kalakala plan can accomplish a similar and new version for “today and tomorrow” lease plan (without a competitive process). Then, allow other Co-Developments to construct on top of the towers using a competitive process and a separate lease agreement. This will adhere to WSF needs to attract and encourage private developments of high quality buildings on the properties.

Operation Improvements continued;

WSF and the Kalakala can agree to enter into a joint business arrangement, so that, both parties are able to profit for at least 50 years. For the first 25 years the Co-Developer would use mostly all private funds and management, both parties would share profits and gross annual revenues projected to exceed \$4 million per year from the Kalakala project. Then, at the expiration of the first 25-year land lease (or upon satisfying debt service which ever is greater) the Kalakala and all interior/exterior Co-Developed improvements and all other Kalakala project assets are donated to the WSF via a charitable trust. But, the private Co-developer shall still privately manage the day-to-day business activities and operations for at least another 25 years using a renewed Kalakala project lease agreement.

Customer Amenities

The icon Kalakala project may enhance the City waterfront tourist zone, and attract more tourists south towards the Pioneer Square district. The Kalakala would improve WSF art and cultural events, City tax revenues, and enhance the WSF Coleman Dock as a future world-class waterfront tourist destination. The pedestals and open public space project element could help to attract more social, outdoor/indoor business, and waterfront concert events.

WSF Revenue Enhancements; Future competitive Kalakala grant applications (State, Federal, and local), and public bonding and other local funding resources could assist WSF annual and long-term capital budgets and operating revenues and profits. And, enhance other public and private community charitable events, private tax incentives, and investments.

Amenities:

WSF Seattle Ferry Terminal – Coleman Dock Kalakala project could enhance a 1st class waterfront mixed-use structure that would include; a maritime and transportation museum, arts and cultural center, historic café, five-star waterfront dining, open public space for viewing the Kalakala (world renowned maritime icon) and amphitheater for indoor/outdoor entertainment,

and other attractive waterscapes, aquatics, and fishery designed elements.

Comment (received 5/19/2006 via Agency):

The US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the Notice of Intent for the Washington State Ferries Seattle Ferry Terminal Project in Seattle, WA in accordance with our responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments at this stage of the environmental impact statement (EIS) development process. Section 309, independent of NEPA, specifically directs the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to review and comment in writing on the environmental impacts associated with all major federal actions. Under our policies and procedures, we evaluate the document's adequacy in meeting NEPA requirements. We have enclosed a copy of "EPA's Section 309 Review: The Clean Air Act and NEPA", which provides further elaboration of our EIS review responsibilities.

The scoping comments that follow are provided to inform the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) of issues that EPA believes to be significant and warrant explicit treatment during the NEPA process. In providing these comments, it is our goal to have these issues addressed in the draft EIS.

We appreciate the opportunity to participate early in the planning process for this project and are available to discuss issues or answer questions that arise while you develop the draft EIS.

NEPA Review Unit

US Environmental Protection Agency
Scoping Comments for
Seattle Ferry Terminal Project

Developing the Purpose and Need

Generally the EIS should include a clear and concise statement of the underlying purpose and need for the proposed project, consistent with the implementing regulations for NEPA (see 40 CFR 1502.13). In presenting the purpose and need for the project, the EIS should reflect not only the NEPA lead agencies purpose, but also the broader public interest and need. Given the size of this project, a concise statement is of critical importance to setting up the analysis of alternatives, which could range from too tightly focused to too broad, depending on how the statement is written. The March 23, 2006 draft Purpose Statement could be more effective if the opening paragraph describes the overarching goal(s) that lead to the specific primary objectives.

We suggest the purpose and need include a primary objective to "accommodate and move passengers using a variety of travel modes, such as auto, foot, and bicycle." We believe this is an important objective and will result in valuable screening criteria for use in picking the range of alternatives and later for comparing the alternatives and developing mitigation.

Public transportation generally requires less infrastructure and causes fewer environmental

impacts than travel that involves one car for each person. We recommend the propose and need provide some emphasis/focus for solutions involving non-SOV travel such as, "increase the attractiveness of non-SOV travel, improve the ease of non-SOV travel." This has the benefit of serving a broader public interest and need, working towards a long term outcome that improves multi modal choices for travelers, and working on alternatives that will generally have fewer environmental impacts.

Other WSF Objectives - Controlling Fares through Non Fare-Box Revenues

We may not fully understand the rationale for the Washington State Ferries' objective to "control fares through non fare-box revenues" and to reduce the ferry use cost to passengers. Given our current understanding, we see some benefits to keeping the user cost linked to the project cost, unless there is an Environmental Justice issue or a specific broader public interest or need that you are trying to address. Our main concern is that there could be undesirable and unexpected consequences from reducing fares. For example, the transportation cost of "living far from work" would be subsidized, making these distant locations more affordable and desirable than they are now. This would enable and encourage (induce) more growth at those distant locations, accelerating the rate of growth so that planned capacity will not last as long and additional capacity would need to be provided. We believe this would likely be in the form of expanding the urban growth area (UGA) or increasing the density within the existing UGA. It may not be consistent with the current local comprehensive plans. The effects of expanding the UGA or increasing density within a UGA could then result in increased and unanticipated effects on the local communities, the built environment, and/or the natural environment. In light of these potential adverse effects, we believe it will be important to consider the possible unintended consequences of this type of strategy.

Selecting the Range of Alternatives

Important alternatives for serious consideration include:

- An alternative that provides multiple levels of parking/holding over water in order to reduce/minimize the amount of overwater coverage.
- An alternative that moves the bulk of the overwater structure away from the shoreline into deeper water.
- An alternative with as much of the facility on land as possible, including offices.

Alternative screening/evaluation criteria should include:

- Alternative's ability to serve the needs of multiple travel modes (auto, foot, bicycle)
- Alternative's infrastructure flexibility if projected travel mode (auto, foot, bicycle) ratios change
- Alternative's ability to provide passenger-only ferry service
- Alternative's ability to support and encourage less impacting modes of travel (non-SOV), including ferry transport for foot and bicycle passengers (potentially eliminating or delaying future expansion needs)
- Alternative's avoidance/minimization of over water/near shore infrastructure and facilities
- Alternative's avoidance/minimization of non-water dependent uses in the short term and long term
- Alternative's ability to restore the near shore area
- Alternative's ability to provide opportunities for public access and recreation

- Alternative's ability to support long term aquatic resource and ecosystem recovery goals

We also recommend considering different scenarios for auto and passenger ratios. This would help describe a range of possible outcomes. It would be very helpful to the public and decision makers to understand the social and environmental implications if the division between user types is different.

We understand that the responsibility to run passenger-only ferries may be transferred to another agency. At this point, we are assuming there could be a need/value for passenger-only ferries at some point in the future. For the purposes of this EIS, we would like the alternatives to consider the need for passenger-only ferries. Passenger-only ferry options and how they would be managed should be included in the alternatives, as appropriate. If the NEPA lead agencies believe there is no need for passenger-only ferry service, neither now or in the future, the EIS should discuss the rationale for this conclusion.

We understand alternatives that include a codevelopment component might not be consistent with existing state and local regulations. Such regulations would likely need amendments before they could be implemented. If these alternatives are considered reasonable under NEPA and SEPA, EPA recommends they be analyzed in the EIS prior to pursuing amendments to existing regulations. The EIS information about environmental and community impacts could provide decision makers with the important and necessary environmental information to be used when deciding whether to amend an existing regulation. It would also aid local jurisdictions in their consideration of the environmental impacts of their nonproject decisions such as amending a Shoreline Master Program, Comprehensive Plan, or Waterfront Plan.

Range of Effects/Impacts

NEPA calls for analysis of effects and impacts in a broad sense, addressing important issues that arise during scoping. Impacts from a project may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant effect may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the effect will be beneficial. There can be situations when adverse impacts occur even though regulations are met. For example, several air toxics are not regulated but are known to create a health risk. Therefore, it is important to consider impacts that may not be managed through existing regulations. The environmental analysis needs to evaluate and disclose the impacts from all emissions regardless of whether there is a regulation that manages those emissions. "Potential violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment" is but one of the ten factors that should be considered in evaluating severity of impact (40 CFR 1508.27(b)).

Impacts to Air Quality

There is heightened concern for human health from projects that result in air toxics emissions and particulate matter from mobile sources, particularly diesel exhaust. The National Air Toxics Assessment, <http://www.epa.gov/tln/atw/nata>, asserts that a large number of human epidemiology studies show increased lung cancer associated with diesel exhaust and significant potential for non-cancer health effects. Also the Control of Emissions of Hazardous Air Pollutants from Mobile Sources Final Rule (66 FR 17230, March 29, 2001) lists 21 compounds emitted from motor vehicles that are known or suspect to cause cancer or other serious health

effects.

EPA recommends that the EIS disclose whether vehicular air toxics emissions would result from project construction, discuss the cancer and non-cancer health effects associated with air toxics and diesel particulate matter, and identify sensitive receptor populations and individuals that are likely to be exposed to these emissions. The EIS should then identify and commit to appropriate mitigation for the identified impacts.

Impacts to Water Quality

The project may include activities that have potential to degrade water quality. Infrastructure demolition; the construction of roads, parking areas, emergency vehicles roads, and a terminal building; and operation of a ferry facility can all alter water quality. Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) requires the State of Washington to identify those waterbodies which are not meeting or not likely to meet State water quality standards. The EIS must disclose which waterbodies may be impacted by the project, the nature of the potential impacts, and the specific pollutants likely to impact those waters. It should also report those water bodies potentially affected by the project that are listed on the State's current 303(d) list and whether Washington Department of Ecology has developed a water quality restoration plan (Total Maximum Daily Load) for the waterbodies and pollutants of concern. If a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) has not been established for those water bodies on the 303(d) list, then in the interim until one is established, the EIS must demonstrate that there will be no net degradation of water quality to these listed waters.

Antidegradation provisions of the CWA apply to water bodies where water quality standards are currently being met. This provision prohibits degrading water quality unless an analysis shows that important economic and social development necessitates degrading water quality. The EIS should explain how the antidegradation provisions would be met for the proposed project.

Impacts and Mitigation for Aquatic Resources

The proposed project (construction, operation, and maintenance) will likely impact aquatic resources: water quality (discussed above), open water habitats, nearshore subtidal and intertidal habitats, and shorelines.

The EIS should describe the current quality and potential capacity of habitat, its use by fish and wildlife on and near the proposed project area, and identify known fish corridors, migration routes, and areas of seasonal fish and wildlife (bird, marine mammal) congregation. Aquatic habitat descriptions should include habitat type, plant and animal species, functional values, and integrity.

These resources will experience varying degrees of impacts and alteration of their hydrologic functions, and project encroachment may degrade habitat for fish, other aquatic biota, and wildlife (e.g. marine mammals and birds). The EIS should evaluate effects on these species and populations from habitat removal and alteration, aquatic habitat fragmentation caused by infrastructure, land use, and management activities, and human activity. Effects on aquatic plant species and populations should be included. Impacts to aquatic resources should be

evaluated in terms of the acreage to be impacted and by the functions they perform.

For any impacts that cannot be avoided through siting and design, the EIS document should, at a minimum, describe the types, location, and estimated effectiveness of best management practices applied to minimize and mitigate impacts to aquatic resources.

It is possible the proposed activities will require a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit from the Army Corps of Engineers. For wetlands and other special aquatic sites, the Section 404(b)(1) guidelines establish a presumption that upland alternatives are available for non-water dependent activities. The 404(b)(1) guidelines require that impacts to aquatic resources be (1) avoided, (2) minimized, and (3) mitigated, in that sequence. The EIS should discuss in detail how planning efforts (and alternative selection) conform with Section 404(b)(1) guidelines sequencing and criteria. In other words, the lead agencies must show that they have avoided impacts to wetlands and other special aquatic sites to the maximum extent practicable. The EIS should discuss alternatives that would avoid wetlands and aquatic resource impacts from fill placement, water impoundment, construction, and other activities before proceeding to minimization/mitigation measures.

Habitat improvement goals (e.g. desired and possible marine/nearshore habitat functions and values in the project area) should be an important aspect of alternative screening, impact assessment, and mitigation effectiveness for this already heavily impacted area. Understanding and Addressing Impacts to Endangered Species Activities at the proposed location for the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project may impact endangered, threatened or candidate species listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and their habitats, as well as state sensitive species. The EIS needs to discuss the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts on all threatened and endangered species and their habitat. Of particular concern are water quality standard requirements for ESA listed salmonids that may be impacted by the proposed project will have on these species' critical habitat, and how it will meet all requirements under ESA.

Public Access and Recreation

This area is part of the Seattle shoreline which is an important area for public access and recreation. We understand this project will be coordinated with the City's waterfront planning process. It will be important to verify that alternatives do not conflict with the planning and to consider how the alternatives can support and work towards the goals for the plan. As part of that consideration, it will also be important to understand if the DEIS alternatives foreclose choices or encourage a particular waterfront outcome. If yes, the draft EIS should discuss and/or reference a discussion (if available) of any environmental effects associated with goals/outcomes precluded or encouraged.

Assessing Cumulative Impacts

It will be important to consider other projects in the area in terms of the timing for these projects, the resources impacted, and any geographic overlap of impact areas. For example, we suspect air quality, traffic, and business operation, at a minimum might be cumulatively impacted by construction of this project and the other projects. Once important cumulative construction impacts are understood, it will also be important for the project proponents to coordinate with other projects in the area, such as AWW, in order to mitigate those impacts.

EPA has issued guidance on how we are to provide comments on the assessment of cumulative impacts, "Consideration of Cumulative Impacts in EPA Review of NEPA Documents," which can be found on EPA's Office of Federal Activities home page at:

<http://www.epa.gov/compliance/resources/nepa.html>. The guidance states that in order to assess the adequacy of the cumulative impacts assessment, five key areas should be considered. EPA will be using the five key areas as a basis for review of the cumulative effects analysis:

1. Identifies resources if any, that are being cumulatively impacted;
2. Determines the appropriate geographic (within natural ecological boundaries" area and the time period over which the effects have occurred and will occur;
3. Looks at all past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions that have affected, are affecting, or would affect resources of concern;
4. Describes a benchmark or baseline; and
5. Includes scientifically defensible threshold levels.

Include a Monitoring Program

As discussed above, the proposed project has the potential to impact air and water quality, marine life (e.g. seabirds, marine mammals, and plants) and habitat. Predicting the severity of these impacts and the effectiveness of mitigation measures is an imprecise science. We recommend that the project include a monitoring program designed to assess both impacts from the project and the effectiveness of measures utilized to mitigate such impacts. The EIS should describe such a monitoring program and how it will be used as an effective feedback mechanism for the proposed project.

Effective Public Participation and Environmental Justice

The EIS should disclose what efforts were taken to ensure effective public participation. In addition, if low income or people of color communities will be impacted by the proposed project, the EIS should disclose what efforts were taken to meet environmental justice requirements consistent with Executive Order (EO) 12898 ("Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations"). This should include the following:

- A description of the methodology and criteria utilized for identifying low income and people of color communities, the sources of data utilized for these analysis, and the references utilized for establishing the criteria.
- A comprehensive accounting of all impacts on low income and people of color, including (but not limited to) cumulative and indirect impacts, exposure pathways unique to the impacted communities, historic exposures, and impacts to cultural, historic and protected resources. In addition, the EIS needs to determine if the impacts to low income and people of color communities will be disproportionately higher than those on non-low income and non-people of color communities. For such a determination, the EIS must identify a reference community, provide a justification for utilizing this reference community, and include a discussion of the methodology for selecting the reference community.

The EIS must demonstrate that communities bearing disproportionately high and adverse effects have had meaningful input into the decisions being made about the project. The EIS needs to describe what was done to inform the communities about the project and the potential impacts it will have on their communities (notices, mailings, fact sheets, briefings, presentations,

exhibits, tours, news releases, translations, newsletters, reports, community interviews, surveys, canvassing, telephone hotlines, question and answer sessions, stakeholder meetings, and on scene information), what input was received from the communities, and how that input was utilized in the decisions that were made regarding the project.

Consultation with Native American Tribes

If the proposed project has the potential to affect historical or traditional cultural places of importance to the area's Native American communities, the EIS needs to identify historic resources, and assure that treaty rights and privileges are addressed appropriately. If the proposed project will have impacts on Native Americans, the development of the EIS should be conducted in consultation with all affected tribal governments, consistent with Executive Order (EO) 13175 ("Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Government"). EO 13175 states that the U.S. government will continue to work with Indian tribes on a government-to-government basis to address issues concerning Indian tribal self-government, trust resources, and Indian tribal treaty and other rights.

Documentation of these consultations should be included in the EIS. Consistent with July 28, 1999 memorandum from the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) to Heads of Federal Agencies, we strongly urge the Corps to consider inviting affected Tribal governments to participate in the EIS development process as cooperating agencies. This would provide for the establishment of a mechanism for addressing intergovernmental issues throughout the EIS development process.

Comment (received 5/18/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

1. Change the location of the automatic pass gates because their present will cause real traffic jams during commuter hours.
2. Use both sides of the ferry's [___?] fork design to load and unload passengers more quickly and efficiently. This should be applied to the Bainbridge Island facility as well.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

3. Develop and install a decent escalator from the terminal to Alaskan Way. The present ramp is unsafe going down and too darn steep coming back up.
4. Improve the elevators which are slow

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

5. Develop and build an automobile holding area for unloading times when the traffic is too heavy for a straight access to Alaskan Way or Marion Street.
6. Improve the training and efficiency of staff that operates the equipment! Now they are almost training every time a boat lands.

Additional Comments:

Why not leave your Third Avenue offices and ride the commute runs to learn about schedules (a joke) and see what the bottle necks really are.

Comment (received 5/18/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

1. Keep the ferries cleaner – they're filthy
2. Provide paper towels in the restrooms
3. Stop increasing the fares!

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Stop raising WSF fares! Don't we pay enough already, why don't you cut staff to save money.

Additional Comments:

Please quit raising fares. As a commuter who works in Seattle it would be nice to see the fare hikes stop. Why don't you cut employees since they don't seem to do much anyway? The ferries are dirty.

Comment (received 5/13/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

- Those turn stiles are a joke. 1. Not enough room between, 2. Should be outside in the terminal when loading the boat won't delay departure. Stupid location.
- Leave on time in the AM at least! And explain why late. Show some accountability and concern.
- Get service Kingston to Seattle

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

There are a lot of travelers - to and from the airport. Connection to the train to the airport would be huge! If it could be done avoiding a vehicle, ie taxi, limo, bus, etc. - walking only to mass transit would be fabulous.

Comment (received 5/19/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

1. To facilitate interface with metro schedule operate ferries on schedule. Whenever the ferry is 10 minutes or more late some of us miss our buses.
2. Help with 1 by adjusting height of Colman foot ramp before ferry arrives. Use radio.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

1. Install hydraulic ramp as at Winslow.
2. Return bus schedule collection to larger size (more route schedules) and more prominent location.
3. Figure a way to let cars turn north or south on Alaska Way when leaving terminal regardless of traffic. Currently WSF contributes to congestion by requiring N. bound cars to go south during certain periods.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

The terminal is on the water where there are naturally views of ferries, water, shipping, boats, the city. Why not try to set it up so that customers in waiting area and elsewhere can see these

views and fully enjoy them? Right now it almost seems as though there is zero attention paid to this. How about a waiting area on a higher level; even on roof.

Additional Comments:

On ferries it would be better for the natural environment, plus more friendly, to encourage people to re-use newspapers rather than making it a priority to snatch them all up 1st thing. Instead make it a priority to refill the roll towels in the heads. If you are going to have shops at terminal try to find a way to encourage real, individually owned and operated shops instead of chain restaurants.

Comment (received 5/19/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

1. Improve the ventilation in the terminal waiting areas.
2. Install 6 oscillating fans in the terminal waiting areas.
3. Remove the fare boxes and have courteous and happy employees greeting commuters and tourists.
4. Quit wasting money on fare boxes/pass/ticket issues that do not exist and lower prices for commuters - walk-ons, bicycle and motorcycle users.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Remove the fare boxes:

1. There was no need for this waste of money and you didn't ask for comments on them.
2. They interfere with people moving through the terminal and handicapped and luggage, strollers, etc.
3. Admit this was a mistake. Remove them. I have seen one person in ten years commuting handing a pass to someone leaving a boat (with a kiss) and so what!

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Improve the ventilation in the terminal. Improve the seating in the terminal. Improve the RR's in the terminals. Improve the water-filter. Add signage with who is in charge of the terminal and contact #.

Additional Comments:

I would like the option to be removed at any time from the mailing list at my request

Comment (received 5/19/2006 via All Aboard):

Please do not eliminate the Vashon-Southworth ferry runs, as we on Vashon depend on it, as do many other on the Island.

Comment (received 5/16/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

1. Wider access ways and ramps for passengers to exit the ferry. It is very slow unloading the ferry. What if an emergency happened?
2. Better signs to let you know how long the wait is for the next ferry. Right now they barely tell you which ferry you are getting on.

3. More holding space. After a Mariners or Seahawks game on a workday it can be difficult to get through to your boat.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Not sure if this question is different from the one above. Should I look at the picture?

1. Agree the transfer spans are inadequate and need updating.
2. Agree the building needs to allow more room or better traffic control on busy days.
3. Don't drive a car so I don't know about the car holding area.
4. What about fixing the walkway from the terminal to First Ave.?
4. Can you unload a boat with 2 ramps? Load and unload actually.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

1. Will it be earthquake proof? During Nisqually they wouldn't let ferries come or go.
2. Hopefully you are looking at foot traffic as much as car traffic.
3. How about noise pollution? When it's foggy the boats use their horns a lot. Bet those new condos on the waterfront won't be happy.
4. How about waste management? You always hear about ships dumping stuff in the water. I've never heard of the ferries doing it so maybe it's already covered.

Additional Comments:

I just hope this doesn't cost an arm and a leg. I live in Kitsap county where it is hard to find a job. Having to do a long commute and pay a lot to do it is discouraging. I hope that fares can remain at a reasonable price otherwise I can't afford to keep using the ferry. Also hope money is spent responsibly. You just remodeled the interior to finally put in some eateries and now you want to replace the whole building? And hope that clock you put outside did not cost too much. It doesn't seem to work.

Comment (received 5/18/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Shorter wait times and ease of traffic flow. Coordinate ferry dock traffic with quick access and ease with highways and freeways.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

- Easy highway access - especially Hwy 99, I5, and I90
- Do not have construction take place same time as Hwy99/Viaduct project - do it afterwards or be sure Viaduct project considers ferry construction and ramps on/off freeways and highways.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Do what is in the best interest of the public. Be responsible and spend the money as though it was your own and within a budget. Do not allow environmental wackos control this. Go with the 80/20 rule.

Comment (received 5/15/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Customers with ferry passes should not have to wait in line

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Why do the dogs sniff cars - but a individual could walk on with a bomb strapped to their body?

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

The terminal should have plants inside and out to help clean the air and employ workers specifically to care for them.

Comment (received 5/15/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Improve quality of food booths; make available all bus schedules for walk-on passengers (King County)

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

By far, that the ferries should be held accountable for consistently getting workers into dock late. We pay for services to be rendered and we would appreciate getting to Seattle ON TIME. This is a DAILY issue.

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

Anything and everything that would negatively impact the environment ie increases in water pollutants due to materials used ie where toxic run-off (including sewage) is going to go besides the water. Alternative fuels for the ferries, that are non-polluting.

Comment (received 5/15/2006 via All Aboard):

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Go ahead and split the triangle. We think it would be better for everyone concerned. Thank you for consideration. Thank you for your good service - we love our WSF.

Comment (received 5/15/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Please do NOT commercialize the public space any further. Encourage more displays of maps heritage, ecology, marine biology, Native American culture, etc.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Install solar panels on roof

Comment (received 5/15/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

Ferry pass holders could have a separate line so the line doesn't get back up so far. This extra line could be phased out once the turnstiles are up and running.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Have more early runs to Bremerton, 5:30, 6:00, 6:30, 7:00. Leave Bremerton @ 3:00, 3:30, 4:00

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

None

Additional Comments:

Adding a fast ferry in between the existing ferry times (to and from Bremerton) would be great and would help the problem of the growing number of people riding ferried.

Comment (received 5/16/2006 via All Aboard):

How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

The current facility is nice. It is more pleasant to grab a snack or some wine than to just sit there.

What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

Please have a credit card only booth. It is maddening to miss the ferry because the 2 cars in front are using credit cards. There should be 2 booths for credit cards and one for ticketed cars!!!!

WSF will study a number of factors during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, such as traffic, land use, water quality, and air quality. What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

The entrance and exit from the ferry is bad. If leaving you have to turn right, it's very difficult to turn around and go north. Also, it is unpleasant to pass the entrance and turn around 5 blocks later in order to get in.

Comment (received 5/19/2006 via Agency):

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the scope of the environmental-impact statement to be prepared for the proposed redevelopment of the Seattle Ferry Terminal. You have also invited comments on the project's draft "purpose and need" statement, the "public and agency coordination plan" required by SAFETEA-LU 6002 regulations, and the draft environmental schedule.

The Colman Dock terminal is an important gateway to Seattle and its location on Seattle's central waterfront contributes to the long-term economic vitality of Seattle's waterfront and the overall Center City. We support developing a new terminal at its current location as a multimodal hub so that it can continue to provide excellent regional access to Seattle's Center

City and better meet the City's goals for the central waterfront. It is important that this transportation hub be designed to meet future riders' needs in a way that is consistent with the land use and community objectives for Seattle.

The attached scoping comments are provided to help ensure that appropriate alternatives are developed and analyzed to meet these and other project objectives and to minimize impacts on the environment. The City of Seattle is committed to working closely with Washington State Ferries throughout the design and environmental review processes.

CITY OF SEATTLE SEATTLE FERRY TERMINAL SCOPING COMMENTS

Introduction

The City of Seattle comments regarding the scope of the environmental impact statement (EIS) to be prepared for the proposed redevelopment of the Seattle Ferry Terminal are organized around: 1) the draft purpose and need-statement, 2) alternatives to be studied, 3) issues that should be studied including ways to avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts, 4) the public agency' coordination plan and the environmental review schedule.

1) Draft purpose and need statement

- a) WSF Long-Range Strategic Plan is currently in draft form and portions of the plan are currently available for public review and comment. Statements in the "purpose and need" statement regarding service recommendations to accommodate growth are based on this draft plan. In addition, the cumulative environmental impacts and mitigating measures for these service recommendations have not been fully evaluated. These service recommendations have significant implications for Colman Dock. For example, changes in service alternatives for the South Sound (i.e., new passenger-only ferry service rather than auto ferry service from Southworth) could eliminate the need for a fourth slip and associated car holding areas at Colman Dock. We request that you identify a process for potentially revisiting this section of the "purpose and need" statement pending the outcome of the final plan.
- b) The third "primary objective" should acknowledge the Terminal's role as a key multimodal hub.
- c) The "purpose and need" statement has only one reference about joint development, which relates that development to a WSF objective, specifically~ that of "generating more revenue from non-farebox sources." It is unclear if one of the project purposes is to facilitate joint development of the site. If this is so, then it should be clearly stated in the purpose and need statement.
- d) The joint development project is identified as the only example of how the WSF objective of generating more non-farebox revenues maybe met. Regulatory factors, or market factors, may playa significant role in determining whether the joint development project can be accomplished. More information about other means of meeting that objective' should be provided, so that alternatives and impacts can be appropriately identified at the scoping stage.
- e) Bicyclists need to be recognized as a user group in the "purpose and need" statement.

f) An environmental objective listing water quality, habitat quality, and air quality (including greenhouse gas reductions) should be added to the "purpose and need" statement.

2) Alternatives to be studied

a) Both the Seattle Municipal Code (SMC 25.05.408) and corresponding section of the Washington

Administrative codes require that scoping include a set of reasonable alternatives and the probable significant adverse impacts of those alternatives. These requirements ensure scoping that adequately and appropriately informs the full environmental process of analyzing alternatives and their impacts. The scoping materials provide comprehensive information on the purpose and need for the project, but little detail on the actual project or alternatives. Early agency consultation and the opportunity this provides to help shape the project are appreciated. Another opportunity to comment on the scope of the EIS, perhaps after the alternatives are identified in Fall 2006, would be helpful to ensure that issues associated with those specific alternatives are fully evaluated in the DEIS.

b) The scoping notice provides little information on the possible joint development associated with the project. Because permitting this development may have significant land use impacts, including regulatory approvals or modifications, these impacts should be included in the scoping notice. However, since these potential impacts have not been included in the scoping notice which only makes a general reference to joint development (a number of alternatives will be considered including varying levels of transit-oriented development), the City requests that they be fully evaluated in the EIS.

c) To ensure the future success of Colman Dock as a multi-modal hub and gateway to Seattle, integrated passenger-only facilities should be included in all alternatives regardless of whether Washington State Ferries operates those services. This facility should assume passenger-only services from Vashon Island, Bremerton, Southworth, and Kingston, at a minimum. Any transferred overwater coverage should be allocated in a manner that allows for this use as well as other associated public uses to support multimodal needs at the terminal.

d) Project phasing should be addressed in all alternatives. This is essential for construction coordination with other projects and to understand how the project will be operated and managed during a phased construction process.

e) The City will not support any alternatives that use the surface level of Pier 48 uplands for auto holding or access.

f) At least one EIS alternative should be "code-compliant" (i.e., allowed under the current Land Use Code and Shoreline Master Program).

g) Because Washington State Ferries does not currently own Pier 48 and transferring overwater coverage is an infrequently used technique, we suggest that you consider developing an alternative that does not require the acquisition of Pier 48 and transfer of overwater coverage for Colman Dock redevelopment.

h) The project scoping should clearly identify whether or not an off-site holding area will be proposed in any alternative. Alternatives should be developed with enough detail to identify whether or not an off-site holding area is proposed, as traffic impacts will be substantially different if such an area is proposed.

3) Issues that should be studied including ways to avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts
Land Use and Shoreline Use

a) There could be broad and numerous significant impacts from joint development, which would require mitigation Areas of potentially significant land use impacts could include consistency with the City's Comprehensive Plan, the Land Use Code, Critical Areas Ordinance, and Shoreline Master Program, as well as with planning documents such as the Central Waterfront Concept Plan and other departments functional plans. All these should be evaluated in the EIS.

b) To understand the potential significance of those impacts, information about the alternatives that include joint development should be included in the EIS. For example, more information about whether Pier 48 would be removed, or regulatory approval for Pier 48's overwater coverage would be sought, could be helpful in identifying impacts. Another example is information about whether there will be uplands development of private residential and public open space as part of the joint development.

Visual Quality, Light and Glare

a) These elements were not identified in your EIS scoping notice and should be added as elements of the EIS. View issues should be given particular attention.

Air Quality

a) This element should be added as an element of the EIS. Mitigating-measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions should be included in all alternatives.

Public Services and Utilities

Storm water

a) Describe the alternative stormwater management systems. How will such systems ensure that stormwater contaminated by the increased number of vehicles over water does not enter Elliott Bay.

b) For each alternative, identify the point of discharge for stormwater runoff. The area is served by combined sewage systems (CSS) with combined sewer overflow (CSO) points into Puget Sound.

These infrastructures were not designed to handle stormwater-generated waterward of ordinary high watermark. Capacity analysis will be required to support the proposed discharge points.

c) If any improvement to the stormwater conveyances system is required, affected CSO structures should be modified to keep saltwater out of the conveyances system.

d) Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) promotes use of Low Impact Development (LID) alternatives to treat and conceivably manage stormwater on site. Such measures should be considered in the project design or mitigation to minimize adverse impacts to stormwater.

e) Seattle stormwater codes suggest choosing roof materials that help achieve water quality treatment requirements. Use of these materials should be considered for structures and other covered areas.

Electrical

a) It is likely that a portion of the WOSCA site will be used as a utility ROW for the Alaskan Way Viaduct (AWV) project. This should be taken into account during the Colman Dock redevelopment planning stage. Also, note that the WOSCA site is being considered for AWV project construction staging.

b) Electrical service to businesses on the West Side of Alaskan Way will be maintained at its

current load throughout the construction of the AWW project. However, any needed increase in services or load may be difficult, if possible, to achieve.

c) Electrical facilities for the newly developed Colman Dock complex will need to be housed within the new buildings. This includes all transformer and service vaults.

d) There are numerous underground utilities in the area being considered for the underground holding lanes. The AWW project has diminished the ability to relocate these utilities to other locations within the area.

Police

The Seattle Police Department would like the following issues studied in the EIS:

a) Provide surveillance underwater, at surface of water and underside of terminal to monitor trespass or potential explosive placement.

b) Provide emergency access for police and fire by watercraft for times when landside access is blocked.

c) Provide a stand-off location for disabled watercraft stranded near terminal, especially for those swimmers who have abandoned their vessel or have fallen overboard and need a water level "raft".

d) Delineate emergency access routes for land emergency vehicles during the construction period and for on-going operations.

e) Provide emergency sally port or parking locations for passenger buses, in the case of a mass evacuation of terminal. Fire personnel would also need temporary facilities for triage of multitude trauma patients and police need temporary facilities for interviewing a multitude of victims and witnesses.

f) Designate an emergency vehicle lane within the queuing and/or holding locations for access to and removal of medical emergencies or criminal arrestees.

Fire

a) Seattle Fire Department (SFD) is primarily concerned with the impacts that will create an effect on demand for services, emergency response times, and dock related fire protection and life safety systems.

b) The project is encouraged to work with SFD on the status and potential co-location of services for Fire Station 5. A separate planning effort with City's Fleet and Facilities Department and SFD will be needed for this coordination.

c) Include in plans, impacts on emergency response routes both onto and past dock during construction and after completion. Access ramp will be required at both ends (north and south) of any structures as well as to slips. In addition, water based fire protection and rescue services should be considered (see similar comments under Police).

d) Consider design addition of physical barriers below structures at waterline to prevent boats and debris from going under structure. This is both a security and life safety issue.

e) Fire water flow requirements for structures need review given concurrent construction schedules for the AWW project and possible limited and temporary water services, this is both a timing and flow quantity issue.

f) A possible underground 'access' point in the vicinity of the Pier 48 uplands may invoke NFPA 502 restrictions depending on the proposed configuration.

g) Consider the impact of turbulence and boat traffic on fireboats

Construction

- a) The EIS should address the potential conflict in construction activities that may occur during the replacement of the seawall (part of which supports a portion of the pier) and the A WV project.
- b) The EIS should address how the construction work at Colman Dock will be coordinated with utility relocation work related to the A WV project that is expected to start in 2008.
- c) The EIS should address how design decisions for the Colman Dock project will be made such that they do not preclude, constrain, or add significant costs to elements of the A WV project in areas such as utility relocations, seawall construction options, and tunnel construction.
- d) During construction of the A WV project, all parking throughout this area will be removed. The EIS should consider the loss of on-street parking during that construction period and its effect on access to, impacts to, and staging at the Colman Dock project.
- e) The EIS should specifically discuss the construction issues related to possible stormwater and outfall system changes.
- f) For each alternative, identify the point of discharge for temporary dewatering during construction. Discharger rates will be limited to available capacities if existing conveyances systems.
- g) Delineate the Elliott Bay sediment cap located within the project area. The cap will need to be preserved (not disturbed) or its disturbance mitigated. Plans must be in place to mitigate accidental disturbance of the cap if construction activities are carried out in close proximity of the cap.
- h) How will the project address the potential for disturbance of contaminated sediments during construction?
- i) SPU encourages the reuse and recycling of construction and demolition debris so that valuable materials can be reclaimed rather than disposed. Deconstruction of existing structures should be planned such that materials such as concrete, asphalt and metals can be reused or recycled.

Plants and Animals

Aquatic Impacts

- a) The EIS should discuss the interactions of any habitat development with existing or projected outfalls for stormwater or CSOs.
- b) Overwater coverage restricts aquatic productivity and alters salmon behavior and available habitat. How does WSF plan to reduce overwater coverage at the project site to enhance aquatic habitat? Evaluate options that make the dock smaller than it is now, perhaps considering staging vehicles on land.
- c) Shading, both from the overwater coverage, and from any buildings on the dock, especially those with multiple stories, will increase the impact to aquatic habitats, species distribution, and salmon migration behavior. In discussing the effectiveness of proposed habitat enhancements/mitigation, include a shading study that makes clear the effect of mass and height of proposed structure on light available to aquatic habitat.
- d) Shading impacts and ways to reduce those impacts (e.g., grating, transparent panels, under pier lighting techniques, and other features that allow light penetration underneath the dock) should be included in all alternatives.
- e) Prop wash from the ferries can have damaging impacts to fish, invertebrates, plants and

other sea life. Please include how the increase in ferry activity will affect sea life on and around the dock, as well as how ferry prop wash may affect the effectiveness of any environmental mitigation actions.

- f) In discussing the effect of prop wash and other ferry operations on nearby habitat, please discuss how these impacts may change depending on tidal elevation at the time.
- g) The area just to the south of the Colman Dock contains some shallow water habitat, which is rare along the Seattle waterfront. How will the project protect this area from damage from any dredging needed for ferry operation, from overwater coverage, and from prop wash? This area could be substantially improved as well and should be considered as a site for mitigation
- h) The redevelopment project offers great opportunities for seawall and shallow habitat improvements and we encourage the project to take advantage of the chance to make a net improvement in the project area for aquatic habitat and the species supported.
- i) Any mitigation and habitat enhancement actions should be monitored before and after to document changes in habitat and the species using that habitat. This information will be critical for effective mitigation and improvement actions along the Seattle waterfront in the future.
- j) How will the project landscaping be designed and maintained to increase the edge vegetation and contribute insect drop to the aquatic food web?
- k) What water quality improvements are expected from removing the timber structure now in contact with the water?

Historic and Cultural Resources

- a) The area inland from the existing facility has known important cultural resources, including Indian 'villages, camps and burial grounds.' Any proposed inland facilities related to the terminal need to be analyzed for potential impacts to cultural resources. Analyses could be dovetailed with the AWV project process.
- b) This major transit terminal could provide excellent opportunities for artistic and interpretive reflection on the layers of natural and cultural heritage in the waterfront area. Collaborations with Tribes and Seattle Office of Arts and Cultural Affairs could be pursued as possibilities for creative mitigation.
- c) Ensure that there is compliance with Section 4(f) and Section 106 with regard to historic resources. Given the project's proximity to Pioneer Square, it is important to evaluate the project's effects on the Pioneer Square Preservation District and landmark properties adjacent to the project in terms of both construction and operational impacts. In addition to the mitigating impacts on the Pioneer Square neighborhood and landmark buildings, it is important that the Section 4(f) and Section 106 evaluations address Pioneer Square areaways if construction or operation will affect those features. The City is concerned not only with the physical affect(s) on historic district and landmark buildings but also the economic health of those communities.

Transportation

Roadway Structures

- a) The Capital Projects and Roadway Structures Division of Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) has operation and maintenance responsibility for the following adjacent infrastructure: Alaskan Way Seawall, Marion Street Pedestrian Bridge and the Washington Street "Harbor Station". These assets should be included in the Ferry Terminal project to the extent necessary to maintain or improve their current functions.
- b) Should the AWV project solution become an elevated structure, replacement of the Alaskan

Way Seawall adjacent to the Ferry Terminal will likely be required. Past Terminal rebuilds (1964) included seawall reconstruction. This issue will need further Discussion about how it should be incorporated in to your EIS documentation.

c) Due to the age and condition of the Alaskan Way Seawall, additional load from the Ferry Terminal project may not be allowed without significant rehabilitation of the Seawall.

d) Existing rip rap that armors the front of the Seawall also retains street fill that supports utilities and the roadway surface. This function must be maintained.

Traffic Analysis

a) All alternatives should include a transportation demand management component with the objective of accommodating planned growth while potentially reducing the need for expensive capital facility investments by effectively managing demand at the facility. This plan should include pricing, methods to shift modes and methods to shift peak travel to off-peak travel.

b) On-street parking and loading will be impacted by the A WV project during construction and for the long-term. All alternatives should acknowledge the potential mid-term to long-term loss of on-street loading facilities and parking spaces.

c) Traffic analysis for this project will need to be closely coordinated with traffic analysis for other adjacent projects including: the A WV project, SR519 Phase 2 and Seattle Department of Transportation's downtown transportation planning efforts.

Pedestrian Access

a) Analysis should include analysis of pedestrian facilities leading to and from Colman Dock under existing conditions and for each of the alternatives studied. The study area for this analysis should extend beyond Colman Dock itself to include all sidewalks and crossings where a large amount of ferry pedestrian traffic is expected. Existing and anticipated pedestrian travel patterns should be included.

b) Mitigation measures for pedestrian impacts should be included for each alternative considered. Elements to consider under mitigation include sidewalk width and queuing space at intersections as well as signal timing elements.

c) Alternatives considered should include multiple pedestrian entrances/exits in order to distribute pedestrian volumes among different facilities.

d) Analysis and mitigation measures should also include the interaction between bicyclists and pedestrians on sidewalk facilities. Do bicyclists use the sidewalks when leaving the ferry terminal?

Can alternative paths be provided?

Bicycle Access

a) Projections for bicycle demand (carry-on and parking) should be forecasted.

b) Current policy and procedure that allow advance loading/unloading of bicyclists should be maintained.

c) Terminal facility design, relating to bicyclist routing from fare booths to ferry loading and from the ferry to the exit, should be evaluated for improvements.

d) Facility design and operations for both the terminal and public right-of-way relating to bicyclists transitioning to and from roadways, sidewalks, and paths should be evaluated for improvements.

e) Terminal facility design relating to bicycle parking needs should be evaluated. Convenient

and secure bike parking for ferry patrons and employees will need to be integrated.

f) Impacts of fare structures in facilitating bicycle access it should be evaluated. Currently, the westbound fare for bicyclists departing from the Seattle Terminal is greater than the fare for motorcyclists.

4) Public agency coordination plan and the environmental review schedule.

a) The City of Seattle is identified as a cooperating agency in the draft coordination plan while the Seattle Police Department and Seattle Fire Department are identified as "participating agencies". It should be clarified that all departments of the City of Seattle would fall under "cooperating agency" status.

b) Coordination with the A WV project is a significant issue that warrants a more detailed coordination plan including schedule coordination.

c) The Fire and Police Departments would like to be involved with periodic coordination and communication with the Coast Guard on this project.

Comment (received 5/18/2006 via e-mail):

I work and live in downtown Seattle and write today concerning the proposed expansion of the Colman Dock. These are also scoping comments on the EIS for the proposed expansion. Please include me on the parties of record list for the dock project and provide me notice of any further actions on this proposal.

The subject proposal is apparently not only for an expansion of the loading and transportation facilities, but also includes possible private development on the dock of a non-transportation nature. While the notice provided does not describe it, apparently plans include the possible development of hotel(s), residential units, offices and entertainment of cultural facilities.

As the WSF is fully aware, the subject property is located over water, below the line of extreme low water. As such the property is subject to the requirements of the Washington State Shorelines Management Act and public trust doctrine. The dock facility is a water dependent use and generally permitted in shoreline areas.

Under the Seattle Shoreline Master Program, Colman Dock is located within the UH or Urban Harborfront environment. The UH designation limits uses overwater in this area and expressly prohibits residential uses and new hotels. See Seattle Municipal Code Sections 23.60.660 and 23.60.338. In addition, the height limit for even permitted activities is 45 feet.

The EIS to be prepared should not consider any uses that are illegal under the terms of the Seattle Shoreline Master Program. If the WSF wishes to consider such proposals, it must first ask the City of Seattle to amend its shoreline master program to allow such uses and/or changes in dimensional standards. Such decisions are subject to review by the state department of ecology and the Growth Management Hearings Board.

The allowance of these uses seems inappropriate. If WSF is allowed to build facilities of this nature, it will create a precedent for others along the central waterfront to do the same. There is a real potential for the walling off of the water front the rest for the city with increased height and bulk front nonwater dependent development. While the goal of WSF to return maximum

investment on its properties is laudable, the use of Colman Dock for these non-transportation uses is not consistent with a variety of regulation and should be abandoned.

Comment (received 4/25/2006 via Agency):

1. How will the various groups (TAG, CAG, etc.) interact; what will their level of authority be. Record the levels of authority and limitations of each group. Provide some help facilitating the involvement of agencies since time is precious.
2. Will there be an eventual weight limit placed on the existing pier—the Fire Department occasionally has a 75,000 pound vehicle on the dock.
3. Where does the existing station fit into the design?
4. Does not see POF facilities in the designs.
5. The City of Seattle Fire Department prefers buildings on dirt over timber piles for fire hazard

Comment (received 4/25/2006 via Agency):

1. What is meant by “off-shore dock?”
2. Why won’t WSF build out to the full site; doesn’t the future growth require it.
3. In the future, as freight movement in the corridor increases, there will be a greater need for better coordination between WSF, POS, and other maritime facility operators. Freight is expected to double and will be operating 24-7
4. Given the strong growth in maritime activity, is the dock going to be big enough?
5. Off-shore islands are actually rather popular and there may be a body of research available regarding their impacts.

Comment (received 4/25/2006 via Agency):

1. Are off-site parking and underground parking still being considered?

Comment (received 4/26/2006 via Agency):

1. Is WSF considering double-deck parking on the dock to minimize the size of new dock?

Comment (received 4/25/2006 via Agency):

1. Doesn’t see any options to specifically comment on.
2. Under the “island” concept, how would you get to the island?
3. Would POF facilities be located at the terminal? Kitsap interested in pier 48 and POF.
4. How will transit be accommodated?
5. Need to include better transit connections in the P&N Statement.
6. What about pedestrian access with this concept? Would it be eliminated?

Comment (received 4/25/2006 via Agency):

1. Appreciates that WSF has been working with the City.
2. SDOT is interested in integrating POF into the project design.
4. This is a significant site to the city.
5. Seattle’s DPD has passed a waterfront plan to the city council that includes specific issues and guidance regarding the development of Colman Dock.
6. City needs to better understand the WSF long-range plan, its relationship to Colman Dock, and impacts/mitigation (especially the impacts of ferry growth on the downtown).

Comment (received 4/25/2006 via Agency):

1. What is being considered in terms of rising water levels resulting from global warming; models indicate a potential 3 to 24 meters rise in the next 30 to 50 years.

Comment (received 4/25/2006 via Agency):

1. Concerned about the land use, environmental, and navigational issues associated with the off-shore island concept.
2. Is site cleanup reflected in the project schedule; when and how will cleanup be handled.

Comment (received 4/25/2006 via Agency):

1. Don't the decisions regarding co-development at Colman Dock depend on decisions related to the AWW preferred alternative?

Comment (received 5/19/2006 via e-mail):

The Seattle Pedestrian Advisory Board (SPAB) thanks Washington State Ferries (WSF) for the opportunity to provide input on the scoping of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Seattle Ferry Terminal (Colman Dock) redevelopment. SPAB commends WSF for the recognition of the need to improve accommodations for foot passengers, including pedestrians with special needs, that is evident in the Purpose and Need Statement (Preliminary Draft for Review). Foot passengers at Colman Dock currently outnumber vehicles by approximately one to three during morning and evening commute hours, and this trend is expected to accelerate. Providing facilities for foot passengers will increasingly drive infrastructure needs: by approximately 2015 the capacity of the Bainbridge Island vessels will need to be expanded to accommodate foot passenger demand, between 2015 and 2016 the number of foot passengers on the Edmonds/Kingston passenger-vehicle route is expected to necessitate an increase in vessel capacity or a direct Kingston/Seattle passenger-only ferry, and by 2030 17,000 daily foot passengers are projected to use the Seattle Ferry Terminal. Meeting the needs of these ferry customers will require excellent pedestrian facilities and multimodal connections from the ferry terminal into Downtown Seattle. Recognition of these needs is reflected in the Purpose and Need Statement.

We have one primary concern regarding the current scoping and Purpose and Need Statement for the EIS. We urge WSF to thoroughly evaluate, minimize, and mitigate the impacts of the redevelopment and growing ferry demand on all pedestrians, not just foot passengers. The increase in vehicular ferry traffic, from both vehicles queuing to depart and vehicles arriving in Seattle, will significantly change the traffic dynamics near the ferry terminal. In the efforts to quickly move vehicles into and out of the ferry terminal, as well as minimize LOS F conditions at intersections near Colman Dock, the safety and convenience of pedestrians must not be compromised. While a redeveloped Marion Street pedestrian bridge, with capacity for two-way foot traffic, might be able to meet some foot passenger needs in the immediate vicinity of the terminal, it would do nothing to meet the needs of pedestrians who are traveling on Alaskan Way. The evaluation and mitigation of pedestrian impacts must go beyond the needs of foot passengers. Ensuring adequate sidewalks, crossing facilities, and convenient signal timing will provide benefits to all pedestrians. Maintaining and improving the safety and convenience of travel by foot will help ensure high volumes of pedestrian traffic on the waterfront, providing customers for the "non fare-box revenue sources" planned as part of the Colman Dock

redevelopment.

WSF has a responsibility to evaluate and address the impacts to non-ferry foot traffic of the Seattle Ferry Terminal redevelopment. In turn, improvements to pedestrian facilities beyond the primary pedestrian ingress and egress to the terminal will provide benefits to WSF's customers and potentially increase non fare-box revenue. Thank you for your consideration of our recommendations.

Comment (received 5/17/2006 via e-mail):

1. How can WSF improve operations and customer amenities at Colman Dock?

By providing a separate entrance and exit for bicycles, pedestrians, and individuals in cars. Presently, bikes mix with cars which is not good. You can also provide more information about wayfinding in the general Puget Sound region inside the terminal building. Pretend you're someone who doesn't even know where Colman Dock is with respect to the airport, or the ocean, or Canada. Give lots of pointers on separate wall areas, make it like a museum with wayfinding information which is both informative, interactive, and fun, but above all else, useful.

2. What improvements at the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project should be considered?

For one, you need a covered and pleasant path - drill a new hole if that's what it takes - from Colman Dock to the 3rd Street Bus/Light Rail tunnel. How are you going to expect people to have a pleasant commute if they get off the ferry and have to traipse three blocks uphill in the cold and rain just to get on a bus or light rail. Think long distances between terminals at airports and moving sidewalks. Why isn't there a covered moving sidewalk - either underground or above ground - from Colman Dock to Third Street? The present method of dumping your ferry commuters on First Avenue is nearly the same insult as pushing them off the boat.

3. ...What additional environmental issues should WSF consider?

How about the impact of taking a ferry back and forth, day in and day out, on the commuter. The stress factor for the passenger, both on the ferry boats themselves, and waiting for departure and what happens upon arrival. Human factors issues. How will the Ferry Terminal integrate into Seattle's summer streetlife down on the waterfront and how will the Ferry system and terminal interact with out-of-town visitors?

I would also like to be added to the project mailing list.



STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY

PO Box 47600 • Olympia, WA 98504-7600 • 360-407-6000
TTY 711 or 800-833-6388 (for the speech or hearing impaired)

May 30, 2006

Mr. Hadley Greene
Washington State Ferries Customer and Community Relations
2901 Third Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98121

Dear Mr. Greene:

The Washington State Department of Ecology, Shorelands & Environmental Assistance Program (Ecology) appreciates the opportunity to provide scoping comments to Washington State Ferries (WSF) for the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project at Colman Dock. Because the formal comment period has closed, we submit them with the understanding that they may not be included in the scoping summary you release. However, you may find them useful in preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

With the limited information that has been produced for review on this project Ecology has done its best at providing you with the following comments on the conceptual design for a mixed-use project:

SEPA

Ecology recognizes that co-development alternatives may not be consistent with existing state and local regulations and may require shoreline master program amendments prior to their implementation. If such alternatives are considered reasonable under NEPA/SEPA, then Ecology recommends that they be analyzed in the EIS for the project prior to pursuing amendments to the master program. SEPA requires local jurisdictions to understand and consider the environmental impacts of their "non-project" decisions such as amending a SMP, Comprehensive Plan, or Waterfront Plan. The EIS information about environmental and community impacts would provide decision makers with crucial information when considering whether to amend an existing master program.

Mixed Use Development

(These comments reference the **Shoreline Management Act (SMA) - RCW 90.58; WAC 173-26-Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Guidelines (2003)**; the **Seattle Shoreline Master Program (1996)**, codified in the **Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) as Chapter 23.60-Shoreline District**; and the **Seattle Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element- Shoreline Goals and Policies**.)



The idea of mixed use development that supports water-dependent and water-oriented uses was envisioned by the Shoreline Management Act (SMA)-RCW 90.58, the Seattle SMP, and WAC 173-26-*the SMP Guidelines*. The SMA established policy that preference be given to uses that are unique to or dependent upon a shoreline location. Shoreline areas are a limited ecological and economic resource and are often the setting for competing uses. The SMA directs local governments to apply the following preferences and priorities when determining allowable uses and resolving use conflicts for shorelines:

- (i) Reserve appropriate areas for protecting and restoring ecological functions to control pollution and prevent damage to the natural environment and public health.
- (ii) Reserve shoreline areas for water dependent and associated water related uses. Harbor areas, established pursuant to Article XV of the state Constitution, and other areas that have reasonable commercial navigational accessibility and necessary support facilities such as transportation and utilities should be reserved for water-dependent and water-related uses that are associated with commercial navigation unless the local governments can demonstrate that adequate shoreline is reserved for future water-dependent and water-related uses and unless protection of the existing natural resource values of such areas preclude such uses. **Local governments may prepare master program provisions to allow mixed-use developments that include and support water dependent uses and address specific conditions that affect water dependent uses.**
- (iii) Reserve shoreline areas for other water-related and water-enjoyment uses that are compatible with ecological and restoration objectives
- (iv) Locate single family residential uses where they are appropriate and can be developed without significant impact to ecological functions or displacement of water-dependent uses.
- (v) Limit non-water-oriented uses to those locations where the above described uses are inappropriate or where non-water-oriented uses demonstrably contribute to the objectives of the Shoreline Management Act.

Evaluation using this criteria, local economic and land use conditions, and policies and regulations that ensure protection of shoreline resources may result in determining that other uses might be accommodated if they are appropriate, considered necessary, and do not have significant negative impacts on the existing preferred uses in the shoreline environment.

Features of this mixed use proposal in the Urban Harborfront location that may not be consistent with the SMA, Seattle SMP or the State SMP Guidelines are **height, uses, view corridors, lot coverage, and expanded over-water coverage.**

1. Height

Some structures in the project are proposed to be 80 feet or higher, but the height limit allowed by the Seattle Shoreline Master Program (SMP) for this Urban Harborfront (UH) shoreline designation is 45 ft. The SMA established the base height for structures within State shoreline jurisdiction as 35 ft. above average grade level. Because of SMA and Seattle SMP height regulations that apply to the waterfront site, **any structures exceeding the regulations could not be built without a shoreline variance permit.**

Applicable Regulations:

RCW 90.58.320 (SMA) Height limitation respecting permits

"No (shoreline) permit shall be issued pursuant to this chapter for any new or expanded building or structure of more than thirty five (35) feet above average grade level on shorelines of the state that will obstruct the view of a substantial number of residences on areas adjoining such shorelines except where a shoreline master program does not prohibit the same, and then only when overriding considerations of the public interest will be served."

Seattle Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Policy L 201 - Height in the Shoreline District

"The 35 ft. height limit of the Shoreline Management Act (SMA) shall be the standard for maximum height in the Seattle Shoreline District. Exceptions in the development standards of a shoreline environment may be made consistent with the SMA and the underlying zoning where:

- A. A greater height will not obstruct the views of a substantial number of residences and the public interest will be served;
- B. Greater height is necessary for bridges or the operational needs of water dependant or water related uses or manufacturing uses; or
- C. A reduced height is warranted because of the underlying residential zone; or
- D. A reduced height is warranted because public views or the views of a substantial number of residences could be blocked.

and:

SMC 23.60.692 Height in the Urban Harborfront Environment

- A. Waterfront lots. The maximum height in the UH Environment shall be forty five (45) feet except in the Historic Character Area where the maximum height shall be 50 ft. as measured from Alaskan way or as modified by C of this subsection (NA).

2. Uses

The current use of Colman Dock is a ferry terminal where vehicles and passengers enter and exit ferries that cross Puget Sound primarily to Kitsap County locations. Washington State Ferries administrative offices, repair facilities, retail shops, small restaurants or coffee shops, advertising kiosks and ticket sales appear to be the main accessory uses on the existing dock and in the existing structure. Uses being considered include all of these and possible condominiums or apartments, hotel(s), larger restaurants and entertainment venues. While Washington State Ferries is exploring ways to enhance the existing transportation center through a mixed use project on Colman Dock, some of these uses may not be compatible with this waterfront and over-water location under the existing authorities as cited above.

3. Hotels

Hotels have been considered and rejected as waterfront uses and the decision was made in the Seattle SMP that hotels would not be located in the Urban Harborfront:

Shoreline District Development Regulations /Urban Harborfront Environment/Part 1 Uses

SMC 23.60.660 - Uses permitted outright on waterfront lots in the UH environment

The following uses shall be permitted over water or on dry-land portions of waterfront lots in the Urban Harborfront environment as either principal or accessory uses:

A. The following commercial uses:

1. Personal and household retail sales and services
2. Marine retail sales and services
3. Eating and drinking establishments
4. **Existing hotels, provided that expansion of the hotel shall be prohibited and expansion only for public access shall be permitted**

This language effectively prohibits new hotels as either principal or accessory uses

5. Parking over water when accessory to a water-dependent or water-related use
6. Parking on dry land when accessory to a permitted use
7. Offices when located above wharf level
8. Entertainment uses
9. Passenger terminals, water-dependent
10. Breakbulk cargo terminals
11. Research and development laboratories, water-dependent, and
12. Food processing and craft work uses;

SMC 23.60.668 - Prohibited uses on waterfront lots in the UH Environment

The following are prohibited as principal uses on waterfront lots in the UH environment:

A. Residential Uses;

B. The following Commercial Uses:

1. Medical services
2. Animal services
3. Automotive retail sales and service
4. **Lodging, except existing hotels**

This language prohibits hotels as a principal use, while earlier it was effectively prohibited as either principal or accessory, except for existing hotels (the Edgewater)

4. Residential use

Residential use in the Urban Harborfront is not preferred because it is not water-dependent, water-related or water-oriented and could have significant impacts on existing preferred uses.

WAC 173-26- 241 Shoreline Uses (3) Standards (j) Residential - "New over-water residences, including floating homes, are not a preferred use and should be prohibited. It is recognized that certain existing communities of floating and/or over-water homes exist and should be reasonably accommodated to allow improvements associated with life safety matters and property rights to be addressed, provided that any expansion of existing communities is the minimum necessary to assure consistency with constitutional and other legal limitations that protect private property."

In addition the Seattle SMP prohibits residences as principal uses on waterfront lots in the UH environment:

SMC 23.60.668 Prohibited uses on waterfront lots in the UH Environment

The following are prohibited as principal uses on waterfront lots in the UH environment:

A. Residential Uses;

B. The following Commercial Uses:

5. Medical services
6. Animal services
7. Automotive retail sales and service
8. Lodging, except existing hotels
9. Mortuary services
10. Offices at wharf/street level
11. Adult motion picture theaters and panorams,
12. Parking principal use
13. Non-household sales and services
14. Mini-warehouses
15. Personal transportation services
16. Cargo terminals, except breakbulk
17. Transit vehicle bases
18. Heliports

19. airports, land-based

5. Lot Coverage

Colman Dock is primarily a constructed dock and pier that is over the water. Most of the proposed uses would need to be located on this over-water structure, which must cover a major portion of its platted lot, although some additional platted area may be on the bed of Elliott Bay. Adding structures on top of existing lot coverage probably does not have any further impacts on the shoreline, but expanding coverage over more of the existing platted lot could have significant negative impacts on the shoreline environment. Under this proposal, Colman Dock's over-water coverage would be increased and capacity for additional buildings and vehicle parking, queuing, loading and unloading from ferries would be greatly expanded.

SMC 23.60.694 Lot coverage in the UH Environment

A. Waterfront Lots

1. Structures, including floats and piers shall not occupy more than fifty (50) percent of the submerged land of any lot, except as modified by C of this subsection
2. Structures shall not occupy more than fifty (50) percent of the dry land of any lot.

6. Views

In addition to the public views of the water possibly being blocked, the multiple envisioned uses could potentially create a wall between the public (and perhaps residences) and Elliott Bay. In addition to SMA and Seattle SMP height regulations that attempt to protect views of Puget Sound and the land forms beyond, the Seattle SMP contains regulations to ensure that sheer bulk does not block these water views. These regulations require that bulk be broken up to allow for significant view corridors through waterfront development.

SMC 23.60.698 View Corridors in the UH Environment

A. Waterfront lots

1. The following standards shall apply to waterfront lots:
 - a. view corridor with a width of not less than thirty (30) percent of the width of the view corridor may be provided at two (2) locations, provided that each has a minimum width of 20 ft.
2. The following may be located in a required view corridor
 - a. storage of boats undergoing repair
 - b. Open wet moorage
 - c. Outdoor storage of items accessory to water dependent or water related use

OTHER IMPACTS

Increased traffic from this complex may move north and south along Alaskan Way and connect to other streets and highways north, south, and east of the site, where it could have negative impacts on properly permitted water-dependent uses in shoreline jurisdiction, or on uses that support water-dependent businesses. The increased vehicle traffic entering and exiting Colman dock could cause congestion along Alaskan Way and connecting streets so that water-dependent industry, commerce, tourism and recreation uses along the waterfront would suffer.

In closing, because possible impacts to shoreline environments are assessed by other agencies and governments with jurisdiction, including Washington Departments of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and Natural Resources (WDNR), NOAA Fisheries, US Fish and Wildlife, Indian tribes, US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and US Army Corps of Engineers, their assessments and opinions regarding possible or probable impacts to aquatic ecosystems are considered by Ecology in regard to project review, permitting, and conditioning. This is consistent with RCW 90 58-020 and WAC 173-27-200.

Ecology welcomes the opportunity to discuss these issues with you and the City of Seattle. We recognize that it is early in the process and many facets of the project must be more fully developed and considered. If you have any questions regarding comments on shoreline issues please contact Sandra Lange at (425) 649-4260 or slan461@ecy.wa.gov. Questions regarding SEPA comments can be directed to me at (360) 407-7503 or kstr461@ecy.wa.gov.

Thank you,


Kerry Carroll

Ecology Transportation Liaison
Environmental Review and Transportation Section